LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

Rittenhouse Orrery

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

Virginia

D. W. Gerhard.

N.Y. [illegible]

THE

Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

T. G. APPLE, D.D.,

PRESIDENT OF MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, MERCERSBURG, PA.

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XVII.—1870.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
54 N. SIXTH STREET.

STORAGE
205
R255
hcp
v. 17, 1870
UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I. DR. EBRARD, AND HIS POSITION ON THE CHURCH QUESTION.
By Rev. W. M. Reily, A. M., Jonestown, Pa. . . 5

II. THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.
By J. H. P. Frost, A. M. 20

III. AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM.
By M. Kieffer, D.D., Chambersburg, Pa. . . . 42

IV. ANTHROPOLOGICAL STATISTICS.
By Lewis H. Steiner, M.D., A.M., Frederick, Md. . 78

V. PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATISM.
By Rev. I. E. Graeff, Tamaqua, Pa. . . . 88

VI. ONCE FOR ALL.
By J. W. Nevin, D.D., Lancaster, Pa. . . . 100

VII. THE PERICOPES, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS AND EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR. I.
By E. E. Higbee, D.D., Mercersburg, Pa. . . 125

VIII. THE BIBLE IN COMMON SCHOOLS.
By D. Gans, D.D., Norristown, Pa. . . . 149

IX. GENERAL SYNOD.
By the Editor. 155

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 162

APRIL NUMBER.

I. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, AS CONFESSED BY THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, THETICALLY STATED WITH THE EXEGETICAL ARGUMENT.
By Charles P. Krauth, D.D., Norton Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania. 165

II. SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL SCIENCE.
By Rev. Theodore Appel, A.M., Lancaster, Pa. . . 242

III. RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN THE CHURCH.
By the Editor. 258

IV. THE PERICOPES, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS AND EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR. II.
By E. E. Higbee, D.D., Mercersburg, Pa. . . 278

V. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 316

ARTICLE. PAGE.

JULY NUMBER.

I. ORGANIC REDEMPTION.
By Samuel H. Giesy, D.D., Philadelphia. . . 326

II. CASPER SCHWENKFELD AND THE SCHWENKFELDIANS.
By Rev. C. Z. Weiser, A. M., Pennsburg, Pa. . . 347

III. UNION WITH THE CHURCH.
By Rev. J. W. Santee, A.M., Cavetown, Md. . . 373

IV. THE MINISTRY ADAPTED TO THE TIMES.
By D. Gans, D.D., Norristown, Pa. . . . 402

V. WHAT IS HEAVEN?
By Rev. F. A. Gast, A.M., Lancaster, Pa. . . 417

VI. THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY.
By David H. Riddle, D.D., Martinsburg, W. Va. . 450

VII. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.
By E. V. Gerhart, D.D., Mercersburg, Pa. . . 461

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 480

OCTOBER NUMBER.

I. ORGANIC REDEMPTION, (Second Article).
By Samuel H. Giesy, D.D., Philadelphia. . . 485

II. GERMANS IN THE UNITED STATES.
By Rev. F. K. Levan, A. M., Pittsburg, Pa. . . 523

III. ORGANIC THINKING.
By D. Gans, D.D., Norristown, Pa. . . . 538

IV. ANNO DOMINI, 79.
By James L. Ferriere, A.M., Philadelphia. . . 561

V. THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF REALISM IN ITS BEARINGS ON THEOLOGY.
By the Editor. 571

VI. FAITH IN CREATION.
By Rev. S. N. Callender, A. M., Greencastle, Pa. 593

VII. CONDITIONS OF SUCCESS IN LIFE.
By Rev. J. H. Dubbs, A.M., Pottstown, Pa. . . 601

VIII. PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN.
By Prof. J. S. Stahr, A.M., Lancaster, Pa. . . 618

IX. CUSTOMS OF THE REFORMED CHURCH OF HESSE.
By Rev. E. W. Reinecke, A.M., Nazareth, Pa. . . 635

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 644

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1870.

Art. I.—Dr. EBRARD, AND HIS POSITION ON THE CHURCH QUESTION.

BY REV. W. M. REILY, A. M., JONESTOWN, PA.

The subject before us for consideration, is, for a variety of reasons, an interesting one. Dr. Ebrard occupies a prominent position among the learned men of Germany; he is looked up to by many as the champion of the Reformed faith; and his works, which are numerous and various, extending almost over the entire range of theological science,* receive the respectful attention of the theological world. Special interest is attached to the inquiry by the two following circumstances. One is: that the system of Dogmatic Theology of

* What Dr. E. has written, as far as we can at present call to mind, is as follows: In the biblical department, exegetical works on books of both the Old and New Testaments, and one on biblical criticism. In the historical department, a complete history of the Church, and a doctrino-historical monograph of two volumes. In the systematic department, a system of Dogmatics; and in the practical also a complete work, embracing the Homiletics, Liturgics, Catechetics and the Pastoral care; besides which he has given to the public several elaborate independent liturgical and hymnological con butions. The last topic which, so far as we have learned, has been claiming his attention, and upon which he has been lecturing before th students at Erlangen, is the Physical Geography of Palestine.

this divine was used for ten or twelve years as a text-book in both of the theological seminaries of our Church, and thus almost half a generation of ministers were trained and moulded under his influence. The other is, that during the controversy which has been going on in our midst, centering in the doctrine of the Church, Dr. Ebrard has been quoted as authority on both sides, and by prominent participants on both sides repudiated and rejected. The question is: where does he stand? His position is what we desire in this article, fairly, and if possible distinctly, to set forth.

The readers of this Review have long since been made acquainted with the fact that Ebrard stands in no sympathy with the unsacramental and spiritualistic theological thinking which prevails in this western world. His view of the significance of the Incarnation separates him at once from this, and indicates that, over against it, his tendency is churchly. According to him, the design of the Incarnation is not merely to make room for the prophetical and sacerdotal activity of our Saviour, which took place during the last three years of His earthly career; it is the introduction of a power of a new, a heavenly and divine life into the history of our race. "Christ," says Ebrard,* "the incarnate Son of God, is the second Adam, *i. e.*, the starting point of a new, sinless, normal development of life. For He took up into Himself the entire development of humanity from Adam to Augustus, which had become abnormal and sinful; and in such a way, that in His own individual and personal development, He purified it, putting away what was bad and impure, and assimilating only the good; and so in an organic way He connected the personal holiness of His own life and conduct with the development of the history of our race as now come to pass, thus as it were engrafting upon it a new and higher form of growth, in such a manner that the life of the new would act back and exert a salutary influence upon the old stock which bears it. Thus Christ stands related to what was past, as the pure and purifying beginning of a new form of existence."† What was involved in the Incarnation

* Praktische Theolog., page 32. † *Ib.*, p. 32, etc.

could only be realized through the death, resurrection and ascension of our Saviour, for in this way alone, so far as the individual is concerned, was Regeneration possible; which is according to Ebrard: the miraculously wrought real implantation of the glorified humanity of Christ into the center of our psychical being, thus introducing into our human life the germ of a life heavenly and divine.*

These are terms which none but a Realist, in the fullest sense of the word, could employ. We have advocates of Realism in our own country, and among them there are such as would be ashamed of the term sacramental as applied to their system. But this is not the case with Dr. Ebrard. He assigns to the sacraments that prominent place which is due them in the Realistic system, for according to him it is by these ordinances that the implantation of the new life already spoken of, as well as its support and nourishment, is effected. So much significance does he attach to them as to assert that the Church is indebted to their institution for her specifically New Testament character. He goes further, and asserts again and again in both his dogmatics and practical theology that the Church rests upon the sacraments.

Dr. Ebrard, then, is no Spiritualist or Puritan. Between his system and theirs there is a wide gulf. And in accordance with the statements of his which we have quoted, the Church must be for him more than they ever dream. They say that the Church is the aggregate of those who confess the name of Christ and seek the conversion of the world. It is the coetus of the saints. But Ebrard goes further, and calls it a grace-bearing institution. It stands in living connection with celestial powers and agencies. "The streams of a heavenly glorified life" pour into it. Through its agency the nations are to be evangelized by the proclamation of the truth; but more than this; through its agency mankind is brought into an inner substantial life-union with the Redeemer by the administration of the sacraments.

---

* Praktische Theol., p. 35.

With this representation of Ebrard's view of the work of Redemption, and his conception of the Church as logically evolved from it, viz., as "the historical institution in which and through whose mediation the Holy Spirit effects the regeneration, sanctification and glorification of the individual and the entire race,"* one might suppose that the problem is already solved. Are not the statements here made decisive? The topics touched upon are ruling ones, and he assumes high ground. There is hardly room for doubt, it might be added, as to where the writer stands, for nothing unchurchly or unsacramental could be included in a consistently developed system, of which these theses formed a part.

But our problem is as yet by no means solved. The precise position of the great theologian is still a question. Whilst our peculiarly American type of Christian life is something altogether foreign to his nature, we find him at times giving expression to sentiments which look like the direct opposite of High-churchism. There are those too which sound not unlike spiritualism. And astounding as it may appear, he is charged in certain circles with holding views closely allied to Baptist doctrine and practice.

It would be a great mistake to refer this seeming confusion in the mind of Dr. Ebrard to any want of earnest thinking on the subject. We know of no Protestant theologian of Germany who exhibits a livelier sense of the immense practical importance of proper views on the question of the Church. "What is the Church? What is its true nature and character? What was it that its divine Founder designed it to be?" this is the question with which he starts out in his work on Practical Theology; and this for him is the point on which this weighty science rests. The exposition of his theory of the practical work of the ministry is based upon the answer to this question, which he gives in a discussion of over a hundred pages, which he calls the primary or introductory division of his work, the remainder forming the second or special.

---

* Dogmatic, Vol. II, p. 475 of the 1st Edition.

He first inquires, what do the Scriptures directly represent the Church to be? He then proceeds to theorize on the subject, deducing what he conceives to be the true idea of the Church from the nature of the work of redemption. He gives further a statement of the false views which prevail in reference to the nature of the Church. On the one hand we have Pietism, Separatism, Methodism and Puritanism; on the other Confessionalism, Successionalism, Hierarchism and Ceremonialism. Now, none of the forms of theological thinking here designated, and the diseases of Church life connected with them, are essentially false and wrong. Ebrard maintains that there is a truth underlying each one of them; and that the error consists in laying undue stress upon this truth, and carrying it out to a logical extreme without regard to other truths of equal weight and significance. All of these errors take their start in an improper intonation of some of the attributes or functions of the Church. For instance, viewed in one relation to the work of redemption, the Church may correctly be regarded as *coetus sanctorum*, and in another as *mater fidelium*. The Methodist and Pietist prefer to regard it in the light of the former, whilst the Hierarchist and Ceremonialist in that of the latter. Again, the Church has an ideal and a real side. On the one hand it is a divine power and agency, the organ of the Holy Ghost, "the fullness of Him that filleth all in all." On the other hand its membership is composed of human beings, each one of whom is infected with that depravity which cleaves to our nature, and from which we are not entirely released until "this corruption puts on incorruption, and this mortal immortality." Now the Separatist and the Puritan keep their eye fixed upon the latter feature, and cannot be made to see the paramount prominence and significance of the former; whilst the Confessionalist and the Ceremonialist are so deeply impressed with the fact that the Church "is the pillar and ground of the truth," and "the Jerusalem that is from above," that they cannot perceive any admixture of human error and corruption in what properly belongs to it.

Ebrard believes that there is no system of religious thought

or form of Church life which is absolutely free from one or the other of the errors referred to. Just as the human body is never in an absolutely healthy condition, inasmuch as some one part of the system, weaker than the rest, is more susceptible to some form of disease, and thus there exists at least an abnormal predisposition, so it is impossible to point to a form of Church life, in which there is not to be found at least a tendency to one or other of the diseases designated. And accordingly we find him earnestly enjoining upon those who are to become ministers in the Church the importance of avoiding everything like a one-sidedness, by giving due attention to the truths which underlie both of these opposite classes of systems.

Surely here is sober thoughtfulness on the question of the Church, and it seems to be fair and unprejudiced. After all this one would suppose that Dr. Ebrard would not fail to have correct views on the subject, and that he would be a safe guide for the theological youth of Germany as well as of our own land. It must be conceded, that as the result of the discussion above referred to, we have a number of practical hints on the subject, which are most judicious and wholesome.

He tells us that a discreet minister, with the High-Churchman, will set forth the work of Redemption, as objective and completed; and, like the Methodist, with none the less emphasis, insist upon the personal appropriation of the benefits which, through this work, has been procured for our race. He will not forget that he was not placed into office by the congregation, but by Christ; that he is the agent, not of those unto whom he ministers, but of the Church at large, and that he represents it before them; accordingly that he is not to be controlled by the preferences and prejudices of the laity; although it behooves him to give respectful attention to doubts and difficulties which may, in the proper way, be presented to him. "He will entertain due respect for the Christian Church, her ministers and institutions, keeping in mind that independently of her, as the dispenser of the means of grace, no one can come to Christ;" but he will not shut his eyes to the errors

and corruptions that present themselves in her history, remembering that her development is conditioned by human activity, and that this, whether in the sphere of outward action or of thought, is never absolutely free from imperfection and error. His ministerial career will be regulated with due reference to the sacraments. There can be no legitimate Church activity which does not look to and build upon these. His ministration of the word will in no wise be independent of his ministration of the sealing ordinances. On the contrary, it will seek to avoid the upper air of subjectivism and uncertainty by entwining itself around the firm support presented by our Saviour in these His covenant deeds of grace. Whilst his preaching on the other hand will not consist of mechanical pronunciations of rhetorically prepared religious and theological matter; it will be the living reproduction of that saving truth which has made itself felt in his own heart and life.

This certainly looks like a healthy form of theological thinking. But as, according to his own theory, he would not pretend that his status is an absolutely normal one, so will Dr. Ebrard not find fault with us if we think that we have discovered that *his* defective "predisposition" is in the direction of the pietistic disease. The symptom of this which most noticeably presents itself is the fact that his antipathy to High-churchism is by far more pronounced than that to the opposite error. The latter he seems disposed to spare, as will appear from the following: "The unhistoricalness of the Separatistic tendency is attended with danger rather for the world without than for the congregation tinctured with Pietism or Separatism. The Pietists or Separatists flee to their own Ararat, and let the world go to destruction, instead of coming in contact with it, and exerting upon it a leavenlike influence. The unspiritualness of the High-church tendency brings with it a great spiritual danger *for its own children*, that viz., of security, of torpidity, and the imagination that they live. The High-churchman accordingly lives in far greater danger, so far as the salvation of his soul is concerned, than the Pietist."* We will

* Practical Theol, p. 132.

make another quotation: "The disease of Separatism in its higher stages isolates itself, and thus renders itself harmless: it is its own cure: if anything is in this way destroyed, it is the sect, and not the Church. High-churchism, on the contrary, is like an infectious poison; it circulates in the blood through the veins of the Church, exercising everywhere its pseudo-plastic activity, and by it destroying all healthful movement and real efficiency. Its unwholesome influence upon doctrine is equally rapid and immediate. Inasmuch as the individual is not led to Christ himself in an act of personal, living and effectual faith, but contents himself with his churchliness, and finds his comfort in the Church, which is the dispenser of all grace; the Church assumes the attitude of a *second* mediator between Christ and the Christian. She is no longer the mother, which, as it were, bears her children before her to Christ, and places them in His arms, but she becomes a stepmother, who places herself between her children and Christ and before her children, and takes good care that none of them receive the fruits of the tree of life *except through her hand*, none immediately from the hand of Christ. . . . . The relation of the soul to Christ is made dependent upon its relation to the Church. . . . . The Christian is not capable of reading the word of God, like the inhabitants of Berea searching therein, and of reaching Christ immediately and in personal believing knowledge; the Church must interpret it for him. Thus it is not only *possible* to explain the errors of Popery from the principle of the High-church disease, but it is *necessary* so to explain them; and whoever does not see in them anything but mistakes and theoretical errors of the understanding, or false apprehensions of single passages of Scripture, and not the symptoms of a *disease*, whose beginnings and roots are to be found outside of the Romish church, and within Protestantism, has not yet apprehended Romanism from afar, and stands in peril of becoming a prey to the same system."*

Before proceeding further to set forth the views of Dr.

* Praktische Theol., p. 133. *et sq.*

Ebrard on particular points involved in the question before us, we direct attention to the fact, that in common with other German theologians, *e. g.*, Nitzsch and Lange, he makes a distinction between the Church and the kingdom of God. Between this latter and the world the Church is a *tertium quid.* He calls it in one place its "garment," which will be laid aside at the second coming of Christ, when there will no more be a church; then first will the real visible kingdom of Christ be established upon the earth. When we take into consideration the fact that Dr. Ebrard objects to the distinction between a visible and invisible church, we might suppose that his distinguishing between the Church and the kingdom of God is nothing more than an exegetical view, carrying with it no special dogmatic significance. But this seems not to be the case. Whilst he maintains that this kingdom can exist *in re* only at some point in the future, he holds also that *in potentia* it is already here. But it is an invisible sphere, and is made up of what he calls the deutero-adamitic humanity, those, viz., who stand in the same relation to Christ in virtue of the new birth, as the natural man stands to the first Adam, according to the law of human procreation. In other words, the kingdom of Heaven, in its present invisible incipient form, is composed of those to whom has been imparted the power of our Saviour's glorified life. But the Church has taught, from the beginning, that all who are baptized stand in this relation to Christ, and accordingly that all who are baptized belong to the kingdom of God.* But not so Ebrard. According to him there are many baptized who are still *proto-adamites*, and against whom the charge cannot be made that they have fallen from grace. They must first exercise a certain degree of contrition, have certain experiences, and reach a certain amount of perfection

* Conf. Confession of Westminster, XXV. Art. 2. "The visible Church, which is also Catholic or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility o salvation."

before they can be included among the chosen few.* Is not this, after all, tantamount to the rejected distinction between the visible and invisible church; nay, more, does it not look like a "predisposition" to the Methodistic form of the unchurchly disease? But we leave this subject, to pass over to the consideration of one which goes hand in hand with it, viz.: Infant Baptism.

From what has just been said, the inference would be a natural one, that children cannot get into the kingdom of God. This would be going farther than most of our unchurchly sects. There are many among those who adhere to the prevailing evangelical system, who not only acknowledge that the complete regeneration of children is possible, but that in very many cases it occurs at the time of baptism. Dr. Ebrard does not shrink from the opposite conclusion. The following are his words: "The child, as it is born of the flesh, notwithstanding the fact that its conscience is not yet positively seared, is not capable of entering into the kingdom of God" (*unfähig in das R. G. einzutreten*)†. He maintains that the new birth, in the scriptural sense of the word, cannot take place until repentance and faith have been wrought in the heart by the power of the truth, and pronounces as magical the theory of a substantial impartation of Christ's glorified life to those whose consciousness is as yet undeveloped.

It is hard to charge upon Dr. Ebrard anything like Spiritualism in connection with the subject of the sacraments. So far from intentionally countenancing sacramental views of this

---

* "The conception of the kingdom of God relates exclusively to the inner posture of the heart toward God, and the future redemptorial result. Accordingly, for the present the kingdom of God is an invisible diaspora known alone to God." Prac. Theol. p. 30.

Conf. also Dog., Vol. II, pp. 388, 399. "The kingdom of God is within us (inwendig in uns), it consists of those in whose case the seed of the means of grace, has fallen upon good ground. Precisely as the mass of the truly converted is it for the present invisible to men, and known alone to God, and is to be visibly established at that point in the future, when Christ will for the second time appear. The kingdom of God does not subsist for the present in the form of a visible historical concrete communion; it consists of the separate (discrete) number of those who have really become deutero-adamites, and in whom Christ reigns."

† Dogmatic, Vol. II, p. 615.

nature, he seems at times to struggle against occasioning such an imputation. As the full grace signified in baptism is not conveyed to the infant, and as this want cannot be supplied by the sacrament of the Supper, in which what was born in the other receives the nourishment necessary to its sustenance and growth, one might conjecture that the want would have to be met in the form of some subjective process. But Dr. Ebrard does not meet the difficulty in this way. He resorts to the objective act of confirmation, to which he ascribes a mystical and sacramental character, involving and sealing the regenerative activity of Christ in the case of those who have been baptized, and afterwards come to Him in the exercise of repentance and faith. Accordingly, in confirmation Christ implants Himself into those who, in baptism, had been implanted into Him. Although Dr. Ebrard thus struggles to do full justice to the objective, and to remain true to his position, that what he calls the anagenetic activity of Christ is indissolubly connected with the ordinances of His Church, still the unchurchly tendency appears distinctly in this: that although he acknowledges infant baptism to be warrantable, yet he denies that it is necessary; that he looks upon it as no source of consolation for bereaved parents; and that he goes so far as to say, that it is only with peril to the souls of a congregation when it is declared to them: "You are baptized, and accordingly you are born again: all that you have to do is to come to a clear consciousness of what you possess, and let it become within you a living power." *

It is on the subject of the ministry that Dr. Ebrard's churchliness reaches its lowest ebb. He here gets down to a perfect level with the average of our modern American theology. Of course the office is instituted by Christ, and the minister is placed over the congregation by Christ. He is the officer not merely of the congregation, but of the Church at large, and represents it before those to whom he ministers. There is a sense in which the office existed before the congregation, and one too in which ministers are successors of the

* Praktische Theol., p. 40. Note.

apostles. But the difference between the minister and his people is only one of degree. He has, or ought to have, more piety and more knowledge than they. That there is any special grace connected with the office Dr. Ebrard entirely denies. If at all, the grace was already possessed before entering the office. Ordination is simply the ratification of what is supposed to have already taken place when the candidate for the ministry has passed a successful examination. That this ordinance might be placed on the same footing with confirmation, and that the same "mystico-sacramental" character which he ascribes to it might belong to ordination, seems hardly to have occurred to him. On this subject he expresses himself as follows: "The official calling does not proceed from the congregation, but the bearers of the office do, and they receive the spiritual gifts essential to their ministry, not because and so far as they have been formally called through succession, but because and so far as they are believing members of the congregation. The truth that only those members of the congregation who are living Christians should be called into the ministry, should not be perverted into the assertion: 'Whoever is legitimately called has the Holy Spirit.' This fallacy, which turns the truth into its very opposite, is the essence and principle of the Papacy. Instead of saying: 'A Christian filled with the Spirit, therefore a minister of the Church, they say: 'A minister of the Church, therefore gifted with the Spirit.'"* Again he says, and somewhat more forcibly: "It is an abominable perversion of the truth when the Puseyites say that the office as such, in consequence of ordination, possesses the Holy Spirit. The statement: Only converted, regenerated and advanced Christians should receive an office, or whoever has or will receive an office *should* have the Holy Spirit, is perverted into the statement: Whoever has an office, *has* the Holy Spirit. Likewise is the truth: that because a Christian, therefore a member of the Church, turned into the falsehood: because a member of the Church therefore a Christian. Such conclusions from the *should* to the *is* are not to say

* Praktische Theol., p. 89. † *Ibid.* p. 49.

illogical, but in this sphere absolutely wicked." † If, now, the question be asked: in what way, and through what channel does the minister receive the authority and dignity of his office? Dr. Ebrard would answer by pointing to the case of the Apostle Paul, who "received his vocation not from or by men, but direct from the glorified Master, and through the Holy Ghost." This point is further illustrated as follows: "A Puseyite at the Church Diet at Elberfeld propounded the unevangelical question: How can I, who am a sinner, preach repentance to others, unless my office empowered me so to do? It is to be answered simply thus: Every really Christian shoemaker's apprentice takes the power, the right, the calling and the courage to preach repentance as well as the Gospel to his comrades, from the fact *that his sins have been forgiven him.* This has something, but the office has nothing to do with the matter." * So hostile is Dr. Ebrard to the idea of anything priestly connected with the ministry, that he tacitly approves of the preference of a table instead of an altar in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.†

The last point on which the views of Dr. Ebrard are to be set forth is Cultus. He concedes that the sacraments form the basis or foundation of the entire public service of the Church, and insists upon the use of fixed forms of prayer. All prayers connected with the celebration of the sacraments, the confession, thanksgiving for the grace of redemption, intercession for Church and congregation, petitions for present divine assistance, and thanksgiving for the Word as preached and heard, are to be read from the Agenda; the minister is free alone in the composition of the short prayer or collect which is attached to the sermon, and in the selection of the hymns. But whilst the sacraments afford the basis of Cultus, he maintains that the sermon forms its substance and centre. To this he makes all the prayers to be subordinate. If prayer in the wide sense of the word is an independent element in worship, it is so only in the barely formal sense that between it and the celebration of the sacrament or the preaching of the word, a hymn may

* Praktische Theol., p. 57. † Dog. II, p. 678.

be sung. Although he does not condemn responses, he still seems to entertain an antipathy toward them. On this subject he expresses himself as follows: "Just as a naked symbolism is dangerous and wrong, so is also the tendency suspicious, in complicated liturgical formulas, responses, &c., to set forth externally what should rather take place within. It is entirely proper to permit the congregation to respond to the confession of sins, with a verse from a penitential hymn, and to the offering up of thanks with one from a hymn of praise. But when a long series of spiritual acts is stretched out, fixed and formed into an antiphony, it gets to be something suspicious. Can it be supposed that the actions of the heart will correspond, in such rapid succession, to a complicated responsorial series? Will not the attention, in consequence of the complication, be attracted from the internal to the complicated liturgical formula? Through the frequent repetition of these formulas will not the whole affair become at last a mechanical and prattling ceremony (*Mechanismus und Plapperwerk*)?" *

As we stated in the beginning of our article, from the stand-point of our American Puritanism and Spiritualism, the attribute of churchliness may rightly be ascribed to Dr. Ebrard. But how is it when his position is viewed from the stand-point of the Creed? And by the Creed we believe that he is willing to be judged. If anything at all is intended by introducing the Church as an article of faith, and by assigning it the position which it occupies in that symbol, it seems to us that it must be this: that the Church is an essential factor, or part and parcel of that blessed, mysterious and glorious work, whose accomplishment was aimed at when the Word became flesh. Now, it may seem arrogant in us to say so, still we cannot help but think that Dr. Ebrard has not come to look at it in this light. Whilst he does make some expressions which might be so interpreted, we believe that no valid ground can be assigned for attributing to our author any higher view of the Church than that of a *sine qua non* in the work of redemption.

* Praktische Theol., p. 227.

That we are correct in this, is already rendered probable by what we have set forth in this inquiry. But in the following sentence he seems to tell us so himself: "Whilst the Separatist forgets that the Church-organization (*Kirchenverband*) is a *conditio sine qua non* in order to attain to faith (because we are led to believe, through the word of God, and this is one of the Church's means of grace), the Puseyite, on the other hand, dreams that the *conditio sine qua non* is the *causa efficiens.*"* All the way through his writings, so far as we are acquainted with them, we get the impression that the existence of the Church is a sort of mechanical necessity; that although it is the organ of the Holy Ghost, the mother of the faithful, and the dispenser of the means of grace, still the integrity of the plan of salvation would not suffer a particle if the Word could be preached, the sacraments be administered, and the Holy Spirit work in some way without it. We doubt whether he believes that the Church is the organic unfolding of that divine principle of life which was imparted to humanity in the Incarnation; and of a divine presence, before which a Peter of the present day could bow and confess: "To whom shall I go but unto thee?" we hear from Dr. Ebrard nothing. Nitzsch in his answer to Moehler says that for Catholics the Church ceases to be an article of faith; for in that they make it exclusively visible, it becomes something which is no more to be believed in than the republic of Venice. But to this it might well be responded: You, with some other evangelical theologians of Germany, tear it from *the* Creed, and depose it from its rank as an article of faith, by reducing it to a level with other facts and truths of Christianity, which are only accidental and conditional.

* Prak. Theol., p. 113.

ART. II.—THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

BY J. H. P. FROST, A. M.

To the Christian mind the primary idea of the state of death is that of rest. The grave, which is the literal resting-place of the body, is figuratively used to express the abode of the disembodied spirit. "There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary are at rest." But as the mortal remains are borne to the grave by surviving friends, so are the righteous dead borne unto their rest by ministering angels. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom." Luke xvi. 22. And of our blessed Lord Himself it is said, that at His death "He went and preached unto the spirits in prison." 1 Pet. iii. 18—20. This is understood to refer to the same state or place that is intended by "Abraham's bosom;" to the same place referred to in the passage just quoted, from Job iii. 17, 18: "There the prisoners rest together;" and to mean the abode of departed spirits prior to the resurrection and day of judgment, and before the righteous are finally received into heaven. This has been termed the intermediate, or middle state, in which the wicked await the last judgment, and in which the righteous anticipate their final triumph. It is also called "the Valley of the Shadow," for clouds and darkness rest upon it. Not indeed upon the glorious and assured resurrection of the dead; still less upon the future heaven of eternal blessedness. But simply upon this intermediate state, which is emphatically called "the land of shades," "the region and shadow of death."

In addition to the natural darkness which besets this subject, the reluctance of many Christian teachers to develop the

light which really belongs to it, has had the effect, apparently, of favoring such a misunderstanding of the rest of the righteous dead, who "sleep in Jesus," as leads to positive error. Hence, from want of such plain instruction as may be gleaned from the Bible on this subject, seems to arise that too literal assertion of *sleeping in Jesus*, which makes the souls of the righteous dead remain for ages in an unconscious state. And the language of eminent theologians, who would shrink with horror from such perversion of divine truth, is wrested to its support.* Believing, therefore, that some renewed study of the doctrine of the Intermediate State may be useful at the present time, the following paper has been prepared, and is now offered to the public with the hope that it may be the means of calling attention to this subject. Let us then endeavor, for our own part, to throw as much light as possible upon this obscure, disputed, and perhaps neglected theme. But let us not undertake this work relying upon ourselves; but rather looking for such higher aid as can be obtained "but by devout prayer to that Eternal Spirit that can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and send out His Seraphim with the hallowed fire of His altar, to touch and purify our lips," and enlighten our understandings.

Not indeed until the quick and dead arise at the sound of the last trump, shall be removed all the "clouds of darkness which now overshadow this prison-land, this under-world," or present abode of departed spirits. But this should induce us to seek the more earnestly to remove from this subject all the needless horrors and gloom with which it has been enshrouded by error and superstition. With the divine assistance, let us look for all the light which may be shed upon this doubtful theme. And with this, when found, let us both hope and pray that we may possess our souls in patience,—walking by faith where we cannot by sight, "until the day break, and the shadows flee away."

The proper study of the doctrine of the Intermediate State

* *Vide* "Reformed Church Messenger," August 4, 1869, pages 4 and 6.

requires that we observe the various, and yet, in most essential aspects, similar opinions in regard to it, which have been received by Hebrew, Pagan, Mahometan and Christian believers. And also that we still more particularly examine the different forms of this doctrine, which, at various periods, have been held by the several portions of the Christian Church.

The views anciently prevalent among the Hebrews are best set forth in the works of Josephus, their oldest and most distinguished, uninspired historian. He says:* "Hades, wherein the souls of the righteous and the unrighteous are detained, is a place in the world not regularly finished, a *subterranean* region which is in perpetual darkness, because therein the light of the world does not shine. This region is allotted as a place of custody for souls, in which angels are appointed as guardians to them, who distribute to them temporary punishments agreeable to every misbehaviour and manners. There is one descent into this region, at whose gate we believe there stands an archangel with an host; which gate, when those pass through that are conducted down by the angels appointed over souls, they do not (all) go in the same way; but the just are guided to the right hand, and are led with hymns, sung by the angels appointed over that place, unto a region of light, in which the just have dwelt from the beginning of the world—while they wait for that rest and eternal new life in heaven which is to succeed this region. This place we call *Abraham's bosom.* But as to the unjust, they are dragged by force to the left hand by the angels allotted for punishment."

According to Dr. Jac. Windet, who wrote in 1663, the Hebrews represented *Scheol* to be a place enclosed or shut up, and therefore they speak of its gates; thus they speak indifferently of the *gates of Scheol*, and of the *gates of Death*, as appears by several passages of the Psalms, Job, and Isaiah. There is likewise mention made of the *Keys of Hades*, or hell, in the New Testament, as well as of its gates (Matt. xvi. 19);

* "Discourse to the Greeks concerning Hades." Works of Josephus. New York, 1849, p. 824.

Rev. i. 18. (But if we understand by *Scheol* the grave or sepulchre, we are not to wonder they speak of its gates; because sepulchres hewn out of rocks, or placed in vaults underneath the ground, had actually gates, as well as the Mausoleums).

"The gates of Hell," *Hades*, Matt. xvi. 18; "the gates of the grave," *Hades* in the Septuagint, Is. xxxviii. 10; "O grave," *Hades*, "where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. xv. 55; in these, and other similar passages, *Hades* may properly be understood to mean Death, or the Kingdom of Death. So remarks Neander, "Life of Christ," p. 271; but the *state of souls in death*, by which is clearly intended the Intermediate State,—as distinguished from heaven on the one side and hell on the other,—seems inseparable from all our ideas of death, except that which is restricted to the simple destruction of the material body. Indeed, *dissolution*, the very term most frequently used to express death, itself represents the removal of the soul from the now inanimate body, and implies its separate existence elsewhere.

Long before the time of Josephus the ancient Greeks held a very similar doctrine concerning Hades. And even before them, and still more antecedent to the settlement of the Jews in Canaan, the Eastern nations, and especially the Phœnicians, entertained corresponding views. "Far more general (than the doctrine of the transmigration of souls) was the opinion among the ancient nations that the abode of the departed spirits *is under the earth;* the souls there separated from the bodies were regarded as a sort of aerial beings, or shades."* This place was denominated by the Hebrews *Sheol* (or Scheol), and by the Greeks *Hades;* this latter being the term by which *Scheol* is usually rendered in the Version of the Seventy.

By *Plato*, in the Gorgias and in the Crotylus, Hades is etymologically explained as meaning the invisible, or unseen

---

* Knapp, "Lectures on Christian Theology," p. 524.

world.* The same word is used by Diodorus Siculus, and by Xenophon, in the sense of eternal. The former, in his account of the Egyptians, says: "They call the habitations of the living, *lodging-places* or *inns;* but the abodes of the departed they style *eternal houses*, because they continue in *Hades* during the boundless eternity." There is, in the original Greek, a play upon the words which are translated *eternal* and *Hades;* the words themselves being almost identical in sound, and the latter no doubt impliedly deriving its meaning from the former. (Strictly speaking there are two forms of the Greek, from which Hades may be derived; the one meaning invisible, the other per-durable). A similar phraseology, although not the same in Greek, occurs in Eccles. xi. 5: "Man goeth to his long home;" that is, according to the Greek of the Septuagint, "to his eternal home," or, more literally still, "to the home of his eternity."

From the Egyptians the Greeks derived many of their ideas of Hades, and a poetical name for the same, "the gates of Death," referring—as previously explained—to the massive gates of the sepulchres of the dead, from which, when once they were shut, there was no exit. And the *under-world*, in a spiritual sense, being intimately associated with the physical place of sepulture, in the Hades of Homer, and other Greek authors, the shades of the good and the bad dwell together temporarily, without any marked separation. It will be borne in mind that these opinions were held long prior to the delivery of the inspired Scriptures to the Jews, and that they were

---

* In his Discourse *De Legibus*, Plato distinctly recognizes Hades as a place of (milder or temporary) punishment, separate from Hell. And his language strikingly reminds one of the words of the Psalmist, Ps. cxxxix. 7—12. "Neither shalt thou boast thyself, nor any other, who hast attained to such an unworthy character, of having escaped from this justice of the gods—justice which they who established it, established as the highest of all kinds of justice, and which ought entirely to be reverenced. For thou shalt never be lost sight of by it. Thou art not so small as to hide in the depths of the earth (and be lost sight of there), nor mounting on high shalt thou fly up to heaven (and there escape); but thou shalt receive thy due reward from the gods, either whilst thou stayest here, or in the realms of Hades, when thou hast passed thither; *or when thou art conveyed to a more dreadful place still.*"

altogether formed independently of aid from them. *Tartarus* afterwards came to be regarded by the Greeks as the universal and exclusive abode of the damned. This is the sense in which this word is used by Plato, and later still by Virgil among the Romans. The same word was indeed used by the Jews, in imitation of the earlier and less definite usage of the Greeks, to indicate the place where wicked men and angels are reserved unto the day of judgment.* But the apostle Peter, also manifestly employs the same word, "Tartarus," in a similar sense, speaking of the fallen angels, whom God spared not, but cast down to *hell*, "and delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."†

According to Luke, xvi. 23—26, both the rich man and Lazarus are in Hades; but a wide gulf is represented as separating the righteous from the unrighteous, so that none may pass from one to the other, although they appear, as it were, in sight, and conscious of each other's state. This gulf may be understood to refer to that difference of moral or spiritual state, which our Lord was inculcating; rather than to any merely physical separation, which indeed in the sense we usually understand it, were totally inapplicable to spiritual conditions. A great part of the mystery prevalent respecting the intermediate state, and very much of the manifest confusion concerning Hades, as the temporary abode of the good and the bad, may be obviated and removed by considering that it relates to the moral and spiritual state of the dead, rather than to the particular locality in which they may be supposed to be confined. Not that the locality is to be denied; but that this latter is of much less importance in comparison with the former. Such palpable forgetfulness of the proper spirituality of the sacred Scriptures, and of the essentially spiritual nature of

---

* Compare Josephus, "Wars of the Jews," II. 7; and Knapp, "Christian Theology," *loc. cit.*

† This word, "Tartarus," occurs nowhere else in the New Testament; and in the Septuagint it is found only in Job xli. 32. In this latter passage ("one would think *the deep* to be hoary") it is used in the sense of *the deepest place*, which is its usual signification in the Greek poets, aside from reference to the abodes of the departed.

the subjects of which they treat; and such grossly material literalness of interpretation cannot but encumber its most important because most spiritual themes with "words that darken knowledge."

The "House of Olam," in the Hebrew; the "House of Hades," in the Greek; the invisible state; the unknown abode of unseen departed spirits, all correspond to and represent what Shakspeare terms, "That undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveller returns."

In this "land of shades" the ancient Greeks and Romans believed that the moderately wicked suffered certain expiatory punishments, by means of which they were finally purified, and qualified for happy entrance into the regions of the blessed. This renovating process is prefigured in the manner in which they are described as appearing. According to Plutarch, the souls of men in Hades are stripped of every disguise; they expose to view their true natures in the color and complexion which they assume. And these representative embodiments are derived from the passions which they have been accustomed to entertain and cherish while dwelling on the earth.* Intimately associated with this doctrine of representative forms, is that other, widely extended, pagan doctrine of the *transmigration of souls*, in which the spirit, successively assuming higher and higher *representative*, *animal* forms or bodies, as it gradually advances in expiation and purification, is at last restored to its original human, and now glorious body, and brought back to the presence of God. With this necessarily representative bodily form is therefore connected the equally accepted doctrine of inevitable punishment for sin. And in these long and weary, and often profoundly painful sojourns in baser animal *forms*, these dark-minded pagans believed to be wrought out the great compound process of retribution, expiation, purification and sanctification. Stripped of its gross materialism, reduced to the doctrine of representative spiritual forms, such as express inward character, by external appearance—we may

* Vide Plutarch, "*De Sera Numinis Vindicata.*"

easily discern in this doctrine of *transmigration*, the rudimentary germs of much higher truths which had been revealed—as in the book of Joshua—to the most ancient Church.

The Sixth Book of the Koran contains the teachings of Mohammed on the future life. The dead are subjected to an examination by the angels Munkir and Natkir. Many prominent theologians among the Mussulmen assume the existence of an *intermediate state* for noble unbelievers (pagans). Others teach that the faithful will not remain in hell or Hades forever; and that the prayer for the dead is as useful as that for the living.*

Among the early *Christian Fathers*, we find traces of this doctrine of an intermediate state of departed souls; a state in which the fate of men remains formally undecided until the day of judgment—a state which is therefore neither heaven nor hell. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian, are mentioned as holding such views. They supposed that only some eminent saints and martyrs come at once into heaven, and that only the grossest sinners go at once to hell. This intermediate state, from Luke xvi. 22, they called "Abraham's bosom," in a manner similar to the use of this phrase by the Jews, as just quoted from Josephus. This state, or place, is that to which these Christian Fathers refer the text in 1 Peter iii. 19, in which it is said of our Saviour that "He went and preached unto the spirits in prison."

The author of "The History of the Apostles' Creed, with Critical Observations on its several Articles," "endeavors to prove from the testimony of *all* the Ancients, whether Heathens, Jews, or Christians, that the usual acceptation of the term *Hades*, or Hell, was that it was the common Lodge or Habitation of separated Souls, with Good and Bad, *wherein each of them, according to their Desarts in this Life, and their expectations of the future Judgment, remained either in Joy or Misery.* Among the Heathens he quotes some passages out of Homer and Virgil; but chiefly enlarges on what the Primitive

* Adrian Reland, "Two Books upon the Mahometan Religion," Utrecht, 1705.

Christian writers have delivered about it. To this purpose he produces the testimonies of Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Novatian, Archelaus, Lactantius, Athanasius, Hillary, St. Jerome and St. Austin." Upon that portion of the Creed which says, "He descended into Hell," the same author remarks: "The meaning whereof is no other than this, That His Soul, being Separated from His Body by a real Transition and local Motion, went into the unseen Region of Spirits, where, according to the Laws of Death, it remained amongst other religious and pious departed Souls till the Resurrection of His Body, which was the third day after."*

Upon this same portion of the Creed, Bishop Pearson remarks: "The first place we find it used in, was the Church of Aquileia; and the time we are sure it was used in the Creed of that Church was less than four hundred years after Christ. After that, it came into the *Roman Creed*, and others (as in the Creed attributed to St. Athanasius), and hath been acknowledged as a part of the *Apostles' Creed* ever since."† "At the first reception (into the Church of England) it was propounded with a certain explication, and thus delivered in the fourth year of King Edward VI, with reference to an express place of Scripture interpreted of this *descent:* That the body of Christ lay in the grave until His resurrection; but His Spirit, which He gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in St. Peter (1 Epist. iii. 19) testifieth." So likewise after the same manner in the CREED, set forth in metre after the manner of a psalm, and still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this stave:

> And so He died in the flesh,
> But quickened in the Spirit:
> His body then was buried,
> As is our use and right.

* "History of the Apostles' Creed, with Critical Observations," &c.

† "London: Printed for J. Robinson and J. Reyat, 1702; 8vo. pp. 715." In this first edition, Lord King, the author's name, is not given. The fifth edition was published in 1738, and the work was translated into Latin by *Olearius.*

His Spirit did after this descend
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darkness were—
The true light of their hearts.

Bishop Pearson explains, that among the Greeks (of the Aquileian Church) was found a double interpretation to the phrase corresponding to "*descendit in inferna;*" some understanding *hell*, with reference to St. Peter's words of Christ: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," Acts ii. 27; others understanding *the lower parts*, referring to St. Paul's words: "He descended into the lower parts of the earth." Eph. iv. 9.

After a very full examination and discussion of the Scripture passages bearing on this subject, of the opinions of Christian writers, and of the classical use of the words involved, Bishop Pearson gives the following summary of the whole matter, which may also be received as the accepted and authoritative exposition of the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this connection: "I give a full and undoubting assent unto this (*He descended into Hell*) as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross (John xix. 30), and His Soul was separated from His body, though His body were dead, yet His Soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being so, died in the similitude of a sinner, His Soul went to that place where the souls of men are kept who die for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in Him, and He had fully satisfied for the sins of others, which He took upon Him; therefore as God suffered not His Holy One to see corruption, so He left not His Soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ, of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the Devil and his angels! And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that *Christ* DESCENDED INTO HELL."*

---

* An Exposition of the Creed, by John Pearson, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Chester. Article V, pp. 340 to 380. New York, Ed. 1851.

But this example of Christ's descent into "Hell," and resurrection from the dead, is not of value to His followers in this life only. Even so in like manner the departed spirits of all who believed in Him, *even before He was manifest in the flesh*, and whose faith was accounted unto them for righteousness, Gal. iii. 6, as well as of those who lived afterwards, while they must also remain in this "prison," or intermediate state, until the time of their resurrection, are from Christ's descent into Hades, and preaching to the spirits in prison, and still more from the example of His resurrection, sustained with an assured hope of their own final and triumphant deliverance. So in Acts ii. 25—31, Peter refers the words of David (Ps. xvi. 10): "For Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption," to Christ; and this passage, compared with the other words of the same apostle, already quoted (1 Peter iii. 19), shows that he really believed that while the body of Christ was lying in the grave, His Soul wandered down to the kingdom of the dead, and there preached to the disembodied spirits. This is according to Knapp,* who again expresses the same opinion, in the following concluding words: "That during the time in which the body of Christ lay in the grave He was really dead; and that the human Soul of Christ was in the same unknown condition and place in which the Souls of all the deceased go, and where they continue till the day of judgment."

Dr. Zach. Ursinus,† on the contrary, considers "hell" to be "employed to signify the most extreme distress and anguish." Upon this, remarks Dr. J. W. Nevin:‡ "We have to regret, indeed, always, the turn given to the clause in the fourth Article, *He descended into hell;* where the authority of Calvin § is followed, in giving to the words a signification which is good

---

* "Lectures on Christian Theology," p. 346. New York, 1850.

† "Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism," American Ed., p. 228.

‡ "Introduction" to the same, by J. W. N., p. xv.

§ Calvin, in his excessive zeal against the Doctrine of the Anabaptists of the "Sleep of the Saints," against which he wrote a distinct work, was led to deny, *in toto*, the Intermediate State.

in its own nature, but at the same time notoriously at war with the historical sense of the clause itself."

The late learned and pious Dr. John Dick,* an authority in the Presbyterian Church, commenting upon the passage in the Sixteenth Psalm, says: "Our Saviour is speaking of His death, by which His Soul and body would be separated; *the one going into the unseen state*, the other being laid in the grave. The words are a prediction of His resurrection, and are applied to this event by the apostle: 'David, seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that His Soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption,' Acts ii. 31. God would *bring back His Soul from the invisible state*, and reunite it to His body before it was corrupted. The receptacle of our Saviour's Soul was the invisible state, and the place of His body was the grave."

The Congregational author of a recent Life of Christ, Zachary Eddy, D.D.,† says: "Thus, then, the body of Jesus reposed in the sepulchre. Meanwhile His Spirit, in Hades, is quickened with the new, imperishable life, which, on its return, is to animate, transform and glorify the material frame."

Among some of the numerous sects into which the early Christians were divided, the *Gnostics* are most prominent; both from their number and from the degree of their divergence from the simplicity of the Gospel. Some of these held very curious and characteristic views of Christ's descent into Hades. Thus Marcion, one of the most heretical, and who was excommunicated for heresy, "held that Jesus, after having executed the commission with which He was charged to mankind, descended to the infernal regions, and brought up with Him from them the souls of all the *sinners*, of whom mention is made in the Old Testament; while He left behind him the souls of all the just."‡

The *Scholastics*, or later Christian Fathers, held views similar in general to those already affirmed of their predecessors;

---

* Dr. Dick's "Lectures on Theology." Lect. LX. New York, 1846.

† "Immanuel, or Life of Christ," by Zachary Eddy, D.D. Springfield, Mass., 1868.

‡ Mosheim, "Hist. of Christianity," Century II, Section 65, N. 4.

but they made more subtle distinctions in this, as in other respects. They divided "the subterranean regions, which may be regarded as the intermediate states, between heaven and hell, into *Purgatory*, which lies nearest to hell; *Limbus infantum*, or the abode of those children who die unbaptized; and *Limbus patrum*, or the temporary residence of the Old Testament saints, the place to which Christ went to preach to the souls in prison. This *Limbus* was also called by them 'Abraham's bosom.'" *

Still later, among the *Mystics*, the doctrine of an *intermediate state*, Hades, was especially advocated by Jung Stilling; his sentiments may be gleaned from the following words:† "If the departed spirit, who has left this world in a state of imperfect holiness, carries with him some elements which he is not permitted to introduce into the heavenly regions, he must remain in Hades till he has put away all that is impure: but he does not suffer pain, excepting that of which he himself is the cause. The true sufferings in Hades are the desires still adhering to the soul for the pleasures of this world."

"Between heaven and hell there is an *intermediate place*, called the world of spirits. Every man goeth thither immediately after death; the intercourse which here takes place between the departed spirits is similar to those which men carry on upon earth." ‡

The *Roman Catholic* doctrine of the Intermediate State, commonly called the doctrine of *Purgatory*, has reference almost, if not entirely, to the nominal members of that Church. Its origin and meaning may be plainly seen in the following summary, from Vossius:§ "Origen laid the first foundations of Purgatory, by following Plato's opinion, expressed also by Virgil in the Sixth Æneid; though there be therein consider-

* Hagenbach, "Hist. of Doctrines," Edinburgh, 1852; Vol. II. p. 140.

† *Ibid.* Edinburgh, 1852; Vol. II. p. 464.

‡ Gottliche Offenbarung, E. Swedenborg, Vol. II. p. 284; quoted by K. R. Hagenbach, "History of Doctrines, Vol. IV. p. 464.

§ *Gerardi Zoanus Vossii*, Operum, Tomus Sextus, Theologicus. Amsterdam, 1702. Vossius, a learned Theologian, was born near Heidelberg in 1577, and died A. D. 1649.

able differences between Origen's Purgatory and that of the Papists. The former excluded none out of his Purgatory, but Christ; whereas the Papists receive into theirs only a certain number of persons, who died with some venial sins, for which they never satisfied the justice of God. Origen held that souls did not pass through this fire (of punishment in Purgatory) but at the day of judgment; whereas the Papists say they go thither as soon as they go hence. Lastly, the Papists pretend we can help or deliver souls out of Purgatory, by oblations (Masses) and prayers; whereas Origen and his followers neither said nor thought any such thing."

This doctrine of Purgatory, restricted as it was, to the baptized members of the Catholic Church, whom alone the Papists admitted to possess any possible chance of salvation, was made the means of extorting money from surviving friends, to pay for *masses* and *prayers* to aid in delivering the souls of the deceased from the expiatory sufferings of this state, and in bringing them into heaven, whose keys St. Peter, and after him his Papal successors, were claimed to possess. Matt. xvi. 18, 19. Thus have the self-styled successors of St. Peter, not only perverted the truth of Scripture into a means of spiritual despotism, but virtually assumed as true the very doctrine, "that the gift of God may be purchased with money," Acts viii. 19, 20, which Peter himself so indignantly denied!

Gregory the Great* has been called the inventor of Purgatory; he taught that some minor sins are not pardoned till after death, and was the first who clearly propounded the idea of a deliverance from Purgatory by intercessory prayers, by masses for the dead ("sacred oblations"). Thus the belief in a lasting desire after a higher state of perfection, which death itself cannot quench, and for which the intermediate state was naturally thought to afford opportunity, degenerated into the corrupt doctrine of Purgatory. The Romish Church maintained the existence of a *Purgatory*, to which the souls of all those pious persons depart who die without having made full

* Bishop of Rome, A. D. 590; he died A. D. 604.

satisfaction for their sins: and out of which they may be delivered by means of private *masses* and *indulgences*. Not only the Protestants unanimously rejected this unscriptural doctrine, but also the Greek Theologians, (the Greek Christian Church) *though they admitted the doctrine of an intermediate state of the departed.*" *

It was no doubt from excess of zeal against the errors of the Catholic Church that Calvin, and after him many other Protestant Theologians, went in some respects to the other extreme; as in the present instance, when by their abhorrent revulsion from the corrupt Papal dogma of Purgatory, they were led to reject entirely that doctrine of the intermediate state, upon which indeed this corruption was founded—but which is itself none the less deserving our attention, and none the less worthy of our credence, because it has thus been perverted and corrupted into a means of ecclesiastical hierarchy and spiritual despotism of the basest sort.

The delightful "Country of Beulah," which Bunyan rightly places "beyond the Valley of the Shadow of Death," but incorrectly on the hither side of the "River" of Death—exactly corresponds to the temporary abode of the departed spirits, as already described in the various opinions of the Heathen, Jewish and Christian believers. There the sun shineth night and day, and there "the voice of the turtle is heard in our land;" for there walk continually the shining ones upon the borders of heaven! These delightful anticipations of future blessedness are often indeed experienced in the present life, such as are expressed in the well-known hymn:

"I am waiting by the River,
And my heart has waited long;
Now I think I hear the chorus
Of the angels' welcome song—
O, I see the dawn is breaking
On the hill-tops of the blest,
Where the wicked cease from troubling,
And the weary are at rest."

---

* Hagenbach, Vol. II, p. 308.

But in this land of Beulah—in this intermediate state—when the soul has already passed the dark Valley, and still darker River of Death, and waits in earnest expectation for its triumphant passage to the River of Life, even then may it most emphatically be said to "hear an angel's welcome song," and to "see the hill-tops of the blest." This River of the water of Life, which Milton mentions as flowing "fast by the throne of God," is referred to in the beautiful hymn:

"Shall we gather by the river,
Where bright angels' feet have trod;
With its crystal tide forever
Flowing by the throne of God?
Yes, we'll gather at the river,
The beautiful, the beautiful river;
Gather with the saints at the river
That flows by the throne of God."

It matters little whether we regard the intermediate state as literally a spiritual condition alone, irrespective of residence, or look upon it as the actual, though temporary abode of departed spirits. In either case, however dark and gloomy it may seem to us, it is not so to its inhabitants. To them it is at once a state and a place. A state of separation from the material body; and a state of only anticipative union with the glorified body with which the souls of the righteous shall be clothed in the resurrection, and especially in the judgment, when their blessed condition shall have been finally determined. And a place of abode; since, although spirits, they are neither omnipresent, nor allowed to roam everywhere at large. Thus whether we understand this residence to be upon the earth, but invisible to mortal eyes; or beneath the earth,—the under world,—something doubtful, vague and indistinct,—still is it to its inhabitants no less real, and no less truly enlightened by the loving presence of their divine Lord. "Yea," saith the psalmist, "the darkness hideth not from Thee!" "If I make my bed in hell, behold Thou art there." Ps. cxxxix. 8, 12.

For even hades, the intermediate state, is still a part of God's creation. There is ever felt the light and love of the Omnipresent Father. There still remains the memory of the personal

presence of the Redeemer, and the remembrance that He "preached to the spirits in prison." There are the comforting influences of the Holy Ghost. There too are "the shining ones," "ministering spirits," who having borne the souls of the faithful to "Abraham's bosom," still continue to minister to these "heirs of salvation," until the day break and the last shadows flee away —until Christ Himself, at the end of the world returning with His holy angels, shall call them to the resurrection and judgment.

Therefore the blessed dwellers in this "land of Beulah," while yet they have neither heard the last and glad command, "Enter ye into the joy of your Lord," nor experienced all the glories that shall be revealed, still do they live in the light of His countenance. There free from doubt, incapable of despair, and no longer exposed to sin, they await with patient gladness, His glorious appearing. Thus however gloomy this unseen "land of shades" may seem to us, to these candidates for heaven it is indeed the "land of Beulah," wherein they dwell contentedly in the radiance of the Divine light. For they know in whom they have believed. Here they have communion with the Father of spirits, the Author and Finisher of their faith, and with the Holy Ghost, the Comforter. Here they have always the tradition of the Saviour's visit, when at His descent into hell, "He preached unto the spirits in prison." Here they are associated with the spirits of those who have gone before, of just men already made perfect. And here, finally they have communion with "the shining ones," the holy angels found around the eternal throne, who first conveyed them hither, and who ever attend them, and minister unto them, to enable them to make their calling and election sure by more perfect preparation for entrance into the heavenly kingdom, and into the immediate presence of God Himself. So that these "spirits in prison," may exclaim with the psalmist on earth, and perhaps with even greater reason; "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thy rod and staff they comfort me." Ps. xxiii. 4. And by the rod and the staff of God, in this connection, we may well understand His ministering angels.

It may be that the present teachings of the Sacred Scriptures in this connection, have not hitherto been very generally developed. Many things hidden from the wise and prudent have been revealed unto babes; because they are spiritually discerned. Let us therefore sit like little children at the feet of Jesus. Let us recall the words of our Saviour; "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in Thy name: those that Thou gavest me I have kept," John xvii. 12; and how in another place it is written; "Even so them also *which sleep in* Jesus, will God bring with Him," 1 Thess. iv. 14. This temporary resting-place for the souls of the righteous dead, who sleep in Jesus, while thus a trial of faith to those on earth, becomes the means of strengthening the faith of those who enter into this rest. Heb. iv. 9. For it was to these "spirits in prison" that Christ descended and preached. *To them also, as well as to men on earth, was He visibly manifested; in the flesh to those in the flesh, and in the spirit to those in the spirit.* Thus may He have been said to have been "Seen of angels." And this preaching to the spirits in prison has been most undoubtedly repeated and continued by His faithful believers in the spiritual world, by His ministering spirits who minister to the heirs of salvation; as truly as by the Apostles and their successors on earth!

In His life, in His death, in His resurrection, and in His subsequent glorious ascension into heaven, Jesus is confessedly a leader and exemplar for His disciples. In His death, "*He descended into hell,*" as expressed in the language of the Apostles' Creed. And this death as previously explained, consisted *per se*, in nothing else than the virtual separation from His body, and in His spirit's entrance into the common abode of departed spirits. "For it became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." Heb. ii. 10. Thus was He made to undergo the suffering of death itself, even in its most cruel form. So that now "We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted (or tried) like as we are, yet without sin." Heb. iv. 15. And no

unimportant portion of these sufferings, and of these temptations, or trials, consisted in this descent into hell. And thus from His own experience He became able to succor others; to sympathize with the weakest and most timid of His disciples, as they approach the dark valley with fear and trembling; to sustain them in their hour of bitterest agony, that they may not like Him feel forsaken (Matt. xxvii. 46), and by His own influences, sending the Comforter, (John xvi. 7), and by His "ministering spirits," guiding, consoling and sustaining them even until and during their entrance and residence in the unseen world, where they must tarry till He come again.

As Christ died and descended into the place of departed spirits, so must all His disciples. As He was triumphantly delivered from the power of death in the fullness of time, so also shall His disciples in like manner be delivered. And as Christ was most undoubtedly attended in His descent into the abodes of the dead, by the legions of holy angels who constantly ministered unto Him on earth; so also shall all His disciples, the heirs of salvation (Heb. i. 14), be ministered unto in like manner, in this under-world,—where most they need such heavenly attendance and consolation. In His descent into the abode of the departed, Christ had a spiritual body, which upon His resurrection, and especially upon the occasion of His triumphant ascension into heaven, became a most glorious and truly divine body. So, doubtless, shall His disciples be in like manner endowed, in the spiritual world, with a body truly spiritual and divided immediately from the material body; but which in the resurrection shall "be changed" into one still more glorious, truly representative, and altogether suited for the heavenly kingdom into which they are about to ascend and dwell forever. As "the angels ministered unto" Christ, Matt. iv. 11, in all His trials and temptations on earth, and in the spiritual world doubtless, so much the more; so also do the angels of God act as guardians, and ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation in this present life, and most undoubtedly still more, since they are still more needed,—in the state of death, and in the intermediate or middle state, which is by the Apostle signified by sleeping in Jesus.

This descent of our Saviour into the place of departed spirits, and the residence of the spirits themselves for a longer or shorter time,—most probably to the resurrection and the day of judgment,—being thus plainly shown to be taught in Scripture; and the additional fact that Christ in His "descent in hell," "preached unto the spirits in prison," being expressly affirmed by the Apostle, it becomes important to inquire what may be learned or concluded concerning this preaching. For this event in the life of Christ on earth, although mentioned but rarely and in the briefest terms by the inspired writers, is of the greatest importance both in itself, and as affording a clue to the state of souls in the intermediate state, or spiritual world. And this clue will be still more fully developed and lead to results still more completely satisfactory, if we realize that our Saviour's mission and preaching to the invisible world were most undoubtedly continued by His faithful disciples there, as on earth they were by His appointed Apostolic successors here. When Jesus appeared, even as an infant child, upon earth, His advent was heralded and welcomed with choral anthems by angels and archangels innumerable. The inspired Apostle describes in glowing language, the appearance of "the angel of the Lord," and of "a multitude of the heavenly host," who announced the good tidings of great joy to the shepherds on the plain. But who shall tell us with what resplendent majesty and with what glorious attendance, the Redeemer, triumphant over death and sin, made His appearance in the world of spirits? Who shall describe the thronging hosts of the unnumbered holy, the patriarchs, prophets, priests and sainted kings and princes of the most ancient and Hebrew Churches,—who had believed in the promised Messiah and whose faith in Him had been counted unto them for righteousness; who through silent ages had watched and waited for the manifest appearing of their Divine Lord; and who now rejoiced to welcome and worship Him thus visible in the spirit? Who shall tell us of the countless hosts of those less highly favored, who, sitting in the region and shadow of death, had waited in earnest expectation for the manifestation of the sons of God,—and now saw great light?

Matt. iv. 1. Who can give us any idea of the unutterable glories which illuminated the abode of departed spirits, when the Son of God, their Saviour and their Redeemer, thus visibly manifested Himself unto them, and revealed Himself face to face in visible presence? Who shall tell us what transports of inexpressible delight thrilled the hearts of those "spirits in prison," when thus privileged to recognize, welcome and worship Jesus Christ in His own proper person as the "Emanuel, or God with us?"

It may seem a very simple and easy thing to say that Christ thus "descended into hell;" thus revealed and manifested Himself to the inhabitants of the spiritual world. But the wondrous import of this event may be the better solved, if we consider that quickened by the Spirit He also went and "preached to the spirits in prison." That is, He not only manifested Himself; but He also announced Himself as the Messiah who was to come; He proclaimed Himself in the spiritual world, as before upon earth, as the way and the truth and the life. John xiv. 6. He came here unto His own; and doubtless He met here a far other reception than on earth, where He complained that He came unto His own, but His own received Him not. But to these inhabitants of the spiritual world, to these "spirits in prison," Christ's personal manifestation of Himself, and His preaching, could not have been less interesting or important than was His original advent upon earth! That this is no new doctrine, may be seen from the passage adduced by Justin Martyr, and Irenæus from Jeremiah; "*The Lord God of Israel remembered His dead, which were sleeping in the land of the grave, and descended unto them, to preach unto them His salvation.*" This indeed is not found in the Hebrew; and the Jews were accused of having razed it from the Septuagint.* Hermes, supposed to have been the one to whom Paul sent greeting, Rom. xvi. 14, and after him Clemens Alexandrinus, taught not only that Christ thus descended into Hades and "preached to the spirits in prison;" but that His apostles and

* The probability or possibility of this we do not affirm. Such was the opinion of Irenæus and Justin Martyr.

disciples, when they came into the spiritual world, also imitated His example there—as during their residence on earth.*

According to Knapp;† "In the earliest times, this passage, 1 Peter iii. 18–20, was universally considered as denoting the continuance of Christ in Hades; and this meaning is undoubtedly the most natural, and best suited to the words, the context, and all the ideas of antiquity."—"The Ecclesiastical Fathers of the first three centuries were agreed in the opinion that during the three days in which the body of Christ lay in the grave, His soul was in the kingdom of the dead. They differed in opinion respecting His employment there. Most supposed that He preached the gospel to the ancient believers who expected His advent." The subsequent deviations from this doctrine, it is not within our plan to notice. In conclusion we simply remark that in the earlier and more spiritual state of the primitive Christian Church, there was no doubt as to the reality and nature of the intermediate state, or as to our Lord's descent into it, at His death. In the subsequent grosser forms of belief, especially in the "Western Church," "the opinions of the earlier Fathers were gradually set aside," in these respects. But we fondly believe that under the present more spiritual state of the Christian Church, its members are being prepared for, if not already actually returning to the more scriptural and spiritual faith of primitive Christianity.

---

* For a full statement of these opinions, original and quotations from the writers cited, See "Pearson on the Creed," p. 367, who however is in opposition; so much so as to deny that the text in 1 Peter iii. 18–20, "has any relation to our Saviour after death."

† "Christian Theology," pp. 344, 345.

ART. III.—AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM.

BY M. KIEFFER, D.D., CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

GOD is the sovereign of the universe. His will is the supreme law. All things were made by Him. "It is in, and for, and through Him that all things consist, and for *His* honor and glory they were created!" hence His will is their "norma agendi." The relation between Him and the things which He has made is not external or mechanical, but internal and vital. The laws of nature are not forces that work independently of the divine will; they are the specific forms rather in which that all-ruling will reveals its power and glory. The creation is properly regarded by theologians as an act of God's self-manifestation. This is the first great miracle. So the preservation of all things, or the manner of their existence in time and space, is the continuous manifestation outwardly of the same miraculous power. The laws of nature are usually spoken of as though they were many, yet in their ground they are one. There is but one Creator, but one creation (passiva sumta) and consequently but one law of created being. The endless diversity, and the specific differences, that we everywhere see in nature, do not convey the idea of the *many* different entities, but rather of a manifoldness which always implies unity. God is not nature, nature is not God. Yet nature is not without God's will. It *is* because He wills it, and it is just as He wills it. "The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice, and let the multitude of the isles be glad thereof."

The Christian idea then of divine providence, namely that nothing comes to pass by chance but everything by our Heavenly Father's will, is just as philosophical as it is scriptural. No idea can be conceived of that is more contradictory to reason than the notion commonly entertained that the creation is

a mechanism left to itself by the great Architect, or that it is a great temple without a shekinah. If God is not in nature there ruling by His holy and intelligent will, then He is not in history, and the whole sphere of relative existence is nothing but arbitrariness. It then is; but no one can tell why it is. Its glory has departed, and no reason can be given for anything that comes to pass. Thus a want of faith in God's all-ruling presence turns the very light of nature into darkness.

But the creature sustains a peculiar relation to itself. It is both objective and subjective, irrational and rational, natural and moral. We know but of two classes of rational creatures, namely, angels and men. All else besides these belongs to the sphere of the objective. God's will as active in His widely extended dominion, gives us the idea of His presence and power. Everywhere we see a power, a will, at work which shows itself to be supreme, and everywhere we witness the most implicit obedience to this will. Here already we have a type of supernatural authority and personal freedom. But it is merely a type. Authority and freedom imply reason and will; *i. e.* personality. Authoritative law must needs be the will of a personal being, and FREE obedience to that authority can only be rendered by a person. Hence, as said, nature's obedience to the will of God is a mere type or shadow of personal obedience. God is a personal Being. He has in Himself the absolute authority for all He does both in the physical and moral departments of His dominion; but it is only in the latter that we are properly confronted by the question, What is true freedom? or, what is its relation to authority? Impersonal nature is obedient in a certain sense, as said, it does God's will: it has no power to disobey. It has laws; but it is not conscious of them. It is a volume of truth; but it cannot apprehend its own meaning. It is ever active, but not for itself. Yet it has its medium of conscious intelligence in man, who is its crown and glory. The objective, the natural, has the end of its being in the subjective, the personal, the moral.

In the discussion of our question, therefore, the objective cannot be left out of view. The moral to be real must ground

itself in the natural, whilst both must find their ultimate ground in the absolute. It is not proposed by any means in this article to answer a question which has never been answered, or to solve a problem which in all likelihood can never be solved; namely, *how* God can be a sovereign and man a free agent. The design is to show that the ideas of Supreme authority and personal freedom are not in conflict; but on the contrary that the created will can only be free in authority. The question involves the relation which holds between God and the creature, especially the personal creature. All depends upon the correct apprehension of this relation. It is not enough for us to know that this relation exists, we naturally want to know why it exists. This knowledge we can only gain through the Christian faith. Without the presence and aid of Christianity, the human reason has never been able to solve the problem of the created universe. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Yet the contents of our faith want to be known, the question presses itself upon us: Why is this so? Why this time form of existence in distinction from the Absolute being? Where is the ground of our faith in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth? The answer has been given: "It lay in the nature of God to create; the time form of existence is the natural product of the eternal form of being; hence "NATURE," that which is produced, born. "Certainly so. The idea of the creation could not have been suggested to the Omniscient one by a being above or beyond Himself, for there could be no such being; and besides, nothing can be suggested to omniscience." It lay in the nature of God to create; certainly; for He could not create contrary to His own nature, or His own good pleasure; nor could He actualize an idea foreign to Himself. But our question is not yet fully answered. It still demands: *Why* did it lay in the nature of God to create? *Why* did it please Him to actualize the idea of creation and with it that of His own sovereignty? The question gives us no rest till it shuts us up to the faith in God as the Triune. The relation between God and the creation

cannot be properly apprehended until we have a knowledge of the relation in which the Deity stands to Himself. "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed," &c. But what faith? Is it that of the Sabellian or Arian, whether ancient or modern? This is of no account in our present inquiry. Unitarianism, though it may be as old as Christianity, can give no reason whatever for the creation and preservation of the worlds. It wants to be smart; it boasts much of its superior intelligence; but it is decidedly the most stupid error that can be found within the limits of Christendom! it cannot give a satisfactory account for anything. Refusing to recognize the distinction of persons in the God-head, it cannot distinguish between the Creator and the creation, and thus it favors pantheism.

The faith meant by Saint Paul is the Christian faith in God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. By this we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God. It involves the mystery of the Trinity. God's activity ad extra by which the worlds were made and by which they are preserved, grounds itself in His activity ad intra. This is the ultimate ground of all moral obligation, and consequently the ultimate reason for all authority. The authority to create and rule the worlds is in God, because He is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The trinitarian relation gives us the reason why it lay in the divine nature to create, and rule. To ignore this relation, and yet to hold that God is a personal being is to conceive of Him, the creation apart, as absolute and eternal loneliness. All-sufficient, yet not in communion with Himself! Infinitely glorious, but *absolutely alone* in His glory! The eternal, the absolute idea, yet the absolute oneness!! Whence then the authority to create and to rule? Whence the *idea* of the creation? In the Unitarian faith this idea has not its germ; it cannot have it there. From the absolute oneness can never spring the idea of the manifold or the *many*. From this stand-point there would have been a propriety in Luther's student asking him the question; "What was God doing during that long period of time before He created the worlds?" And there would certainly have been no less propriety in the answer; "God was employed

in making rods to whip the students who should ask such foolish questions." As taught by the Apostle, it is in the Christian faith in God as the *triune* that the idea of the creation finds its germ. Faith in the creation springs from faith in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The authority to create and rule must be absolutely free: *i. e.* God must find the reason or motive of the creation in Himself. This reason or motive is love. "God is love." But love must have an object. God as active in loving is Father, as the object of His own loving activity He is the Son, and as mediating between Himself as Father and Son, He is the Holy Ghost. But this love is reciprocal. As the Father loves the Son, so the Son loves the Father through the same Spirit. Thus the Triune God also knows and wills Himself. His activity ad intra is the *communion* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This communion is absolutely free. Though the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are distinct in person, they are one in essence and in will. This will, as said, is love—free, holy and intelligent love. Free to create, or not to create. Being all-sufficient in Himself, God does not need the creature to add to His essential glory. His communion with Himself is perfect, complete. In it the Deity is beatus. His absolute freedom by which His only begotten Son is chosen and loved in the Spirit, is however the reason or motive for creating and ruling the worlds. The infinite love is not selfish; it would communicate to that which is not itself. It would plant out in the great field of space, millions of creatures to take them all into its own blessed communion. The divine authority to create and rule grounds itself in the divine love, and this being absolutely free, as we have seen, the absolute authority and freedom are identical. It is almost the same as to say that the divine freedom and necessity are identical. "Law is necessity."—"Necessity is that which cannot be otherwise than it really is." This we copy from some of our old notes on Moral Philosophy. But the divine authority or law being absolutely free in itself, is a *free* necessity also when it comes to be law for that which is not itself. This, we say is so because there are three persons in the God-head. God loves

His only begotten Son most freely and intelligently: and yet He loves Him truly and necessarily. God's will then as active in regard to Himself, whatever may be the form of that activity is a free, intelligent, necessity. "But it lay in the nature of God to create," just because, as the inspired Scriptures teach, the idea of the creation holds in His only begotten Son. "The worlds were framed by the word of God." The absolute, the all-comprehensive Word is His Son. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him: and without Him was not anything made that was made." Accordingly the genesis of the creature has its beginning and ending in Him. He is its Alpha and Omega. "In the beginning, in this Alpha God created the heavens and the earth." And when the earth was without form and void, the Spirit that proceeds from the Father and the Son moved (brooded) upon the face of the deep. Order comes out of the confusion. Cosmos succeeds chaos. The process of the six days' work is complete. Man is made in God's image, in His Son, who is the express image of the Father's person and brightness of His glory. Man then is a child, a son of God; because he is the actualization in time of the idea of eternal sonship. By parity of reasoning the same may be said also of the angels. All personal creatures are children of God, because they are created in His Son. The relation then between God and the creature holds in the second person of the adorable Trinity. In other words, this relation is mediatorial. No creature can approach God or call Him Father except in the Son. Even the impersonal creature does not exist in God the Father, the Son apart. In Him all things were created, and in Him they consist.

From this it follows that the will of God, necessarily free in itself, *i. e.* in His Son, is a *free* necessity, and not arbitrary, when it comes to be law and authority for the creature. God created and rules the worlds in love, in and through His Son. The absolute love of freedom is the soul or animating principle of Supreme authority, but is the absolute authority the ground and soul of *relative* freedom? Just here we are met by our first

great difficulty. By faith we can readily apprehend that God is absolutely free. Since there is for His will no limit of time or space, we cannot conceive that there is any limit to His freedom, and for the same reason we cannot conceive that there is a limit to His authority. But in the sphere of relative existence just the opposite of this is true. Here everything is limited, and bound. It is bound by its own inherent nature, it is limited by time and space, whilst, at the same time it is determined by a necessity which is not in itself. It stands under law, under authority. This says to the impersonal creature for instance; "You must obey." The creature replies, "I do obey; I cannot do otherwise; I am not free. I can only move as I am moved." From this it would appear that the exercise of Supreme authority in the sphere of relative being is a restraint, and takes away freedom.

The same authority says to the personal creature, man: "You must obey;" but he has a will of his own, and replies; "I am free, and can act according to my own pleasure." Yes, man is a free agent; he may choose the good or the evil: but he is nevertheless under authority. He may disobey that authority, but if he does he is punished for it. He is free to sin, but he cannot sin with impunity. The divine authority is an every where present restraint from which it is impossible for the personal creature to escape. What then becomes of personal freedom? Is it a reality? Can the created and dependent will be free? If it sins it enslaves itself, and is even less free than unconscious nature. This is our second great difficulty. It would seem as though the idea of human freedom is after all a mere dream or fancy. It would seem as though we had yet to learn what true freedom is. It is certainly not independence. The creature cannot be independent. The very conception is a contradiction. We might as well speak of a dependent independence. Besides no creature can well be more dependent than man. He is the very emblem of dependence, from the cradle to the grave. He is dependent upon nature, upon circumstances, and upon providence. No form of life can be more closely conditioned than that of man. He is "a creature of circumstances:" inclosed by them on every side. True freedom is certainly not the absence of law or authority; because this is

the very first ground and condition of human life. Without it we cannot even exist, much less can we have a free existence.

True freedom we are told is the power of choice between the good and the bad. "The power of choice," says Dr. Alexander, "is the highest form of freedom." But we find that the exercise of this power on the side of the evil is an abuse of freedom, it even destroys it. The will that habitually chooses the evil at length becomes so enfeebled as to be unable to choose the good. We doubt therefore whether the "posse peccare" is freedom; it is certainly not its highest form. Sin is forbidden, there is no authority for it. Shall we say then that the "posse non peccare" is freedom? This possibility is implied by the other. It is the power to refuse the evil and choose the good. The will that perseveres in this choice becomes so confirmed in the good at last, as to be beyond the "posse peccare." Is it then free? Certainly if it was ever free it is free in the "status confirmationis." The saints in glory are certainly not less free than they were in their probationary state. Hence some have said morality, harmony of the human will with the law of God, is freedom. Holiness and freedom are plants that grow upon the same soil. They go hand in hand. The moral, the good, the holy man, is the free man. Shall we then accept this last definition of freedom and be content with it? As a formal definition it challenges our regard. But it does not yet give us the principle of freedom. We naturally want to know what it is in its deepest ground. We want to know *why* the good man is free.

We know why the disobedient will becomes enslaved. We know why the world as "sold under sin" is not free. It is simply because it is no longer in law or authority; but only under it to feel its condemnatory power. Sin makes an end of freedom, just because it changes the life of man from the normal into the abnormal. "The wages of sin is death." "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law." Shall we infer from this that the law can make us free? If it be the strength of sin on the one hand, is it not the principle of holiness on the other, and consequently the strength of freedom?

So it might seem; yet it is not so in fact. The law as such does not give the power to obey its commands. It cannot effect an *at-one-ment* between the absolute authority and the will of the creature. Even where the personal creature stands in the righteousness of the law it is not by a power given by itself. Whilst the law is the norm of the willing activity it is still not the principle of this activity; hence it is not the principle of freedom. For this we must look to a still deeper ground.

The divine love, we have said, is the animating principle of the absolute authority, and hence too of the absolute freedom. This, we affirm, is also the principle of relative freedom. The absolute will is free because it has the divine love as its contents: so the created will to be free must stand consciously in the same divine element; this must be the ground and principle of all its activity. The will of the creature, whether it be that of man or angel, is not free merely because it is will, or because it is rational, but because it has the divine love as its contents: when emptied of these it loses its freedom. Yet these contents must really be its own. The divine love as moving or influencing the will of the finite subject from without is not yet the principle of its freedom. This must be inborn; it must be an essential of the free will itself, in virtue of which it can say; *I* love, *I* obey, *I* am free, and *I* am capable of the ethical distinction. Thus man was created, and for this reason he stood in righteousness and holiness in his primeval state. He is a son of God, born in and with the spirit of filial love; hence free. But why a son and not a servant? Just because he is the actualization in time of the eternal idea of sonship as it is in God's only begotten Son.

This removes our first difficulty in which we became involved when we supposed that the finite will cannot be free because it is finite, because it is limited and bound even by authority. Just as the goodness of God goes out toward all His creatures in and through His Son, so in Him the divine authority is but the law of parental love. Out of Him it would indeed put an end to freedom; but in Him it is the very element and breath of freedom. The Son of God is indeed the very authority by

which man is made free. He is free in law, free in authority. His will having the divine love as its contents is in harmony with the law or will of God in whatever form it may have been revealed. Nature instead of being a limit to his freedom in the form of a stern necessity is for him a beautiful temple in which he holds free communion with his Father in heaven. It is the voice of God addressing him in love. For the same reason the consciousness of his dependence, instead of being a limit to his freedom, is an element of its strength. Conscious that he has no wisdom, no righteousness, no strength of his own the Lord is his wisdom, his righteousness and his strength. Though allied to nature the human spirit ascends above nature and holds communion with the spirit world. It moves and worships freely in the temple not made with hands, the temple which has divinity for its foundation, its walls and chief corner-stone. The Lord's freedom has become human freedom. Hence it is real. It is the absolute freedom in the form of the relative. It is the divine in the form of the human.

The absolute authority then and relative freedom are related by a common principle. They are animated by the same spirit —the spirit of holy love. Hence they cannot be in conflict. Love is the *at-one-ment* of authority and freedom. It is the bond of all personal union and communion. In it, the uncreated will is absolutely free, and all created wills are relatively, yet perfectly free. The divine authority is the divine love ruling: relative freedom is the human, (or angelic) love, born from the heavenly, obeying. The divine authority speaks in love, and in the same spirit the created will heartily and freely responds. This holy bond holds the created spirit in its proper attitude before the Great Jehovah—just the attitude in which it may think and will and live most freely.

But in our effort to define the relation between the Creator and the creature, and especially the personal creature, we discover that it holds in the second person of the adorable Trinity. The Son of God is Mediator per se. *He* is the love bond, the personal love bond, which united in holy and blessed communion the innumerable worlds and created spirits with the uncreated spirit.

This removes the second great difficulty, in which we found ourselves involved when we supposed the "posse peccare" to be in conflict with the true idea of freedom. From the standpoint now gained we see that the divine authority, though it has its end in itself, is nevertheless teleological, and its ends cannot be defeated. It founds its kingdoms, establishes its empires, sets up its thrones, gives its laws, and sends out its edicts, with a view to an end. The kingdom of nature is established. It is Jehovah's first spoken word: but it is a mere prophecy—a mere promise of a still higher kingdom. The natural looks to the super-natural—the earthly to the heavenly—the material to the spiritual—the temporal to the eternal. Civil governments are established. The state is organized, and unfolds its divinely ordained powers. But these too look to an end above and beyond themselves. The reigning state sovereignty looks to an ultimate sovereignty: the civil law looks to the moral law, and the moral to the divine. The Jewish government is established; and as it unfolds its life powers it gives us a *sacred* history in distinction from the world history or the profane: yet it is a mere type or prophecy of a kingdom vastly more sacred and more real. Its Canaan looks to the heavenly Canaan, its temple looks to the temple not made with hands—its kings look to the King of kings and Lord of lords. Finally, the kingdom of grace is established. "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." The Messiah has come. The Saviour is born. The Son of God has become the Son of Man. He becomes the alpha and omega of the new creation. He is born into the world, and humanity is reborn in Him. He suffers, He dies, He descends into hades, He rises from the dead, he ascends into heaven, He sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. The Holy Ghost descends on the day of Pentecost—the Church is planted, the new Jerusalem has come down from above, the supernatural order of things is established in the natural. The ark of man's safety is completed, richly freighted with sacramental grace. The temple of humanity is rebuilt, far more glorious than either of the former buildings in virtue of the

Lord's personal presence in it. Yes, the kingdom of grace is established, and the Lord is seated upon the throne to give repentance and remission of sin. But the end is not yet. Grace is succeeded by glory; the kingdom of grace is to be succeeded by a *kingdom* of glory. This whole supernatural order of things in the natural is but the alpha whose full meaning and glory will be revealed in the heavenly omega.

In all this we cannot fail to see a singleness of aim. The different kingdoms named are but different departments of one great kingdom. The Lord rules in and over all, and the end of His universal reign is His own glory in the final glorification of the personal creature. This is the highest conceivable freedom. So exalted for instance, is the state of the saints in this respect that they are represented in Revelation as reigning with the Lord for ever and ever. The divine authority then is the unfailing purpose carried out to completion, and freedom is the result. They are related as purpose and its accomplishment, and the certainty of the one is the certainty of the other. This is implied by the very name of Him who rules. The Hebrew name Jehovah as applied to the Deity has a peculiar meaning. It does not only imply that God is infinite in all His perfections, and that He is the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth: it means also that God is love, that He has entered into a covenant with Himself that the works of His creation should not fail in accomplishing or reaching the end for which they were designed. The Deity as Elohim (God) created all things, as Jehovah (Lord) He is the everywhere present power by which all things are preserved. As God He is transcendent, infinitely above and beyond the creature; but as Lord He is immanent, the everywhere present power in and for and through whom all things consist. He is the very ground of all existences, the present plastic power by which all things live and grow. He is the certain pledge that God's first grand prophecy, in the form of the creative Word, will be fulfilled. The Lord lives and rules with reference to that fulfilment. In the fullness of time all things will be "reheaded" in Him, all things in heaven and upon the earth. Then the final year of jubilee will have come, the jubilee of heaven.

In heaven the principle of freedom is fully developed, its idea is fully actualized. The Scriptural declaration that "they shall be free indeed whom Christ makes free" shall be fully verified.

Yet heaven is a kingdom: its perfect freedom is freedom in authority, freedom in law, in love, in God. Heaven is the highest kingdom; its glory is the highest glory: its law is the most perfect law: its authority is the immediate revelation of the divine will; and for this very reason its freedom is the highest freedom. The true idea of freedom is concrete. It implies an indefinite number of created wills that are held together in one community by a common life, and are ruled by a supreme will that is in them all and over them all. "The Lord reigneth," and in Him the saints in glory also reign; because His life is their life, His thoughts are their thoughts, His wisdom is their wisdom, His righteousness is their righteousness, and as a consequence His authority is their authority, and also their freedom. In them the idea of relative freedom has come to its full actualization, because they fully apprehend and are fully apprehended by the idea of supreme authority. In it they recognize the principle of their own thinking and willing activity: hence it is free. We had almost said that freedom is the principle of authority *personalized*. In its highest form it is this principle developed in reason and will, *i. e.* in personality. However numerous the personal beings in the created universe, and however far their thoughts may go beyond the limits of impersonal existence, their thinking and willing activities are but the exemplifications of this general principle. The principle of authority, under this view, is Catholic. It is one and holy, and never loses its identity, whilst at the same time it holds in its free and blessed communion the innumerable companies of personal creatures. In this communion alone they are free. They are only free in law—free in authority. For this reason we have said that the true idea of freedom is concrete; and for the same reason we may say it is also general. It is a concrete generality. From this it follows that the love of liberty and the love of authority, or law, are identical; be-

cause they are related as the principle and the forms of its generalization, or as life and the forms of its development.

The truth and correctness of our proposition can be fully illustrated by reverting to the intermediate forms of the divine government already named. As these unfold the principle of divine authority they reveal more and more the true idea of freedom. The objective revelation of the one is the revelation of the other, and the subjective apprehension of the one is also the subjective apprehension of the other.

I. Let us take our principle in the lowest stage of its development, that is, as it is embodied in nature. Here, as said, every thing is bound. Nothing comes to pass except as it is determined by God's over-ruling providence. Man himself as an integral part of nature is bound by its general law. He is lord of the creation, yet he is ruled and determined by it. For him the kingdom of nature is a *moral* kingdom; it controls his will and forms his character. In his normal relation to nature he sees in it his own image, and even the type of his own freedom. Nature itself is free in man. The objective without the subjective has no meaning; but in its concrete connection with it, it is full of truth. The two conceptions do not meet as strangers with a view to mutual acquaintance. The physical world and the human do not stand apart the one looking into the face of the other; they are parts of one great whole. Man is born into the kingdom of nature. His life is *natural.* He is in nature and nature is in him. The relation is organic. In virtue of this organic relation the kingdom of nature is for man a form of divine government. In his infancy, whilst his reason yet slumbers, and whilst his will is merely will in possibility, he is ruled as all other parts of unconscious nature. He is determined by its general law without, in any sense, determining himself. He is so bound up in the physical, so soundly asleep in the lap of nature, as to be entirely unconscious of himself or of that which is not himself. He belongs, so to speak, to the objective. He is apprehended; but he does not yet apprehend. But as soon as he awakes to a consciousness of himself, as soon as the natural light dawns upon the reason, so soon does he find

himself in the position of a learner, a disciple. The objective is the great book, opened before him, from which he is to learn his lessons. He cannot help but look upon it and read. Surrounded by pleasant or unpleasant circumstances, born in a palace or a cottage, he cannot help but see the world into which he has been born. He is under authority, he is in law, he is subjective: he is a subject in a great kingdom. This kingdom, we say is for him a moral government, because in it he is governed by rewards and punishments. He soon learns that he cannot violate the laws of nature with impunity. If he is intemperate in eating or in drinking, if he exposes himself unnecessarily to the heat or cold, if he exposes himself to dangers of any kind, &c., he must suffer the consequences. If on the contrary he obeys the laws of this kingdom, he is blessed and prospered. Here as elsewhere, it is plainly written: "The soul that sinneth shall die, and he that keepeth this law shall live." The natural world it is true is a great physical structure, it is material, yet it is a reality, and as such it is the diagram of an eternal idea. It is the first great edict of divine authority. It is the form of its utterance and the perpetual form of its presence with, and in, the finite subject. Were the law of nature a blind or arbitrary necessity, were it not the expression of a holy and intelligent will, it could neither reward nor punish. But it does reward obedience, and punish disobedience, therefore it must be free and intelligent: *i. e.* it is the will of a Personal Being. This Personal Being, as we have seen, is the Lord. "The Lord reigneth" in and through the works of His own hand. Nature then being the form of the divine presence, and of the divine government in virtue of this presence, it is the comprehensive form also in which the rational creature is apprehended by the divine authority. To violate the law of nature is to violate the divine law. To understand the law of nature and to apprehend it in its deepest ground is to know God's will as revealed in this form.

Now our proposition is that freedom in the sphere of nature depends upon this correct apprehension. Without it there is an irreconcilable conflict between the objective and the subjec-

tive. Man, for instance, in this case finds himself necessitated at every turn of his life. Nature demands of him a constant service contrary to his will. He constantly sees what he does not wish to see, and he must constantly do what he does not wish to do. He is bound; he is a servant; hé is the world's slave. He feels that he has been born into the world not to be free, as a son; but to be under a cruel task master. He longs for deliverance, he prays for freedom, and struggles to obtain it, but in vain; he is bound to the earth, he is in the world, his whole being is closely conditioned, and for him freedom, freedom of life, of thought and will, exists only in idea. Nature itself seems to be incomparably more free than he. It seems to enjoy a constant rest, and uninterrupted play; but he is bound to his place, bound to his toil. The objective world has the mastery. Its power is irresistible. As a mistress or master, it orders man to cultivate the field, to gather the grain, prepare the food, to build the houses, yea to do *all* the work. And he does it, and must do it. His will is not free.

Why is this so? Why this dualism, this actual conflict between the objective and the subjective? Is nature indeed an enemy? Does she sit in her palace as queen, commanding her subjects throughout the whole world to do all the work? And must they indeed do it? Is there no escape? If this be so there is indeed an end of human freedom. The world has never been free; it is not now free. Its relation to the objective is that of blind necessity; it is fate. Yea more, if the relation between the objective and subjective be external as thus described, and as it is generally apprehended, freedom in the sphere of nature is impossible; it cannot exist there even in germ or in possibility. In this case man is in a cage, he is in a prison.

Here we are told: "Let him accept the condition in which he is placed; let him adapt himself to circumstances, let him willingly allow himself to be governed by that which is not himself, then he will enjoy freedom." Poor comfort this. Is the willing slave any less a slave than the unwilling one? Is the prisoner in his cell, after being reconciled to his fate, any less a prisoner than he was before he was thus reconciled? Are

the poor heathen whose providence is all fate, any more elevated and free than those in Christian lands who feel the chains and fetters by which they are bound? The former may be reconciled to their condition; whilst the latter are not. There is no freedom in either case.

The principle of freedom is neither in the objective nor in the subjective, separately considered. Nature of itself cannot give freedom, nor can man obtain it by mere submission to her laws. The principle is broader and deeper than either the objective or the subjective. These are but the forms of its development and manifestation. The principle of freedom is the all comprehensive principle of the divine authority itself, including in ONE organism both forms of existence already named. The objective and subjective forms of being are not two "*concreta*" standing side by side; they are one concretum, related as body and soul. There are not two life principles; there is but one, unfolding itself in a twofold form. As human life is one and simple, unfolding itself in the form of soul and body, so the creation as a whole has but one life, or one all pervading life principle existing in the twofold form of the objective and subjective, the outward and the inward, the material and spiritual. Now it is true, as already intimated, we cannot predicate freedom of the physical, as for instance the human body; yet we can say that man is free when his will is free. In this case he is free in the totality of his being. There can be no real freedom of the body or of the soul separately, for the obvious reason that both are included in one organism. When the whole is free then the parts are free, and so the reverse, when the parts are free the whole is free. The members of the body are free in virtue of their *organic union* with the body of the free man. The outward freedom is the evidence of the inward: or rather it is its expression. The smile playing freely upon the countenance, the free motion of the hands, the freely spoken words, &c. are the unmistakable evidence of the free spirit. So with the great world organism of which we are now speaking. We cannot predicate freedom of the physical or the material as separated from the metaphysical or moral;

but at the same time we cannot speak of human freedom either as disconnected with the natural world. Freedom, like morality, to be real must ground itself in the natural. The moral is the natural elevated into the sphere of will and thought; so human freedom is the natural elevated into the sphere of the free spirit. In other words true freedom must be natural. It implies a normal relation between man and nature, the subjective and the objective: its inward spirit must answer to nature's outward expression. The thing signified must answer to the sign and seal; the thing typified must answer to the type, the idea to the spoken word. The creation as a whole, we have said, is God's spoken word. It is His word authoritatively spoken, and at the same time it is His word most freely spoken. It exists in and by divine authority, and for this very reason the whole also exists freely. The creation is free, nature is free, free in its own general law; that is, it is the expression, the promise, the type, or symbol rather of freedom. The kingdom of nature in its relation to the personal creature, man, is the form by which he is apprehended by the divine authority. Now to be free indeed, that is, to be really *personally* free, he must apprehend even as he is apprehended. He is held by the objective, he cannot escape from its presence, he is in the world, he is a part of nature's great organism. But the apprehending power is not the objective as such, it is the divine authority in the form of the objective. It is not that authority without a body, or without the form, nor is it the form without the divine contents; but it is the divine in the form of the natural. Only he who apprehends the divine authority in the objective is nature's freeman; and he is only free in the degree that he does apprehend. He must *apprehend* that by which he is apprehended. He must know it in its ground, in its principle, as well as in the forms of its development. He must know it especially in its relation to himself, as the ground of his being, as the law of his life, as the law of his thinking and all his willing activity. He must know it also as the general law of the world's being, of its thinking and willing activity. He must know it as the all comprehensive power by which the objective and subjective

are held together as one great organism; as the power which unites the whole time form of existence with the eternal or absolute. He must apprehend *as* he is apprehended. He is apprehended in love. The divine authority by which the world was made and by which it is ruled is love. The outward, the objective, is the symbol of divine love. So the subjective spirit must also apprehend in love. It must needs love the divine authority as such, it must love all the forms of its manifestation. Then its communion with nature will be both intelligent and free.

Finally the subjective spirit must know the divine authority, as symbolized in nature, in its design or ultimate end. Its end as we have seen, is freedom: the eternal glorification of the personal creature.

He who thus apprehends that by which he is apprehended, in its principle, in the forms of its development, in its spirit, and in its holy design, we say is free. He is conscious of his sonship; he is an heir, a child. The human body then is not a cage in which the spirit is confined. The world is not a prison in which man is kept under lock and key. The broad and beautiful field of nature was not designed to be cultivated by slaves. It is the home of the free. The house built by the Father for His sons. It is their birth-place, their family residence. Nature as a kingdom would have all its subjects to be free, free in love, in law, in authority. Hence as symbol it is twofold. It is a symbol of law and authority, and of freedom in law. We say nature is a kingdom; it has its laws. By these it is bound. But it is wonderfully free, just because it is bound. The whole phenomenal world is as it were, a free play of nature: it is so to speak a lawful play. Every thing that comes to pass, every phenomenon, has its lawful cause; yet it seems that the general law of causation gives freedom. Every drop of water in the ocean is under law, yet how majestically free are its swelling waves. The supreme authority has set a tabernacle for the sun, yet how majestically free when he cometh forth out of his chamber and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. Ps. xix. 4, 8. "He goes forth from the end of

heaven, and makes his circuit to the ends of it." How free the movements of all the planets. How freely the greater and lesser luminaries of heaven shed their light upon the earth; how freely they mingle their beams, and smile while they look the one into the face of the other. How free the air by which we are surrounded; how freely the millions of living creatures upon the face of the earth live and breathe in this their proper element. How freely the clouds, those wonderful sailors of the air, move from place to place, and bless the earth with the timely rain. How freely the dew drops are distilled from the womb of the morning. How beautifully free the smile of nature's lovely face whilst it is being fanned by the wings of the wind. How free the waving of the branches and foliage upon the trees of the forest. How free the play of the beasts of the forest, and of the field. How free in their gambols the fishes of the sea. How free in their flight and in their notes of praise the feathered songsters of the air. How wonderfully free the play of all nature! Yet all its freedom is in law, in authority.

Beautiful symbol of human freedom! Man as a child of nature must needs partake of its general character. "Like begetteth like." The law of nature is also the law of his being. Hence he must also partake of the general spirit of freedom which that law gives. Human freedom then is *natural*, and the kingdom of nature is a suitable home for man. It is not a cage, it is not a prison. It is a temple in which the Lord resides. It is a house in which the Father lives. It is the home in which the spirit dwells. Nature then is the form in which the Triune Jehovah takes the human family into His own communion. It is the form in which the creature lives and moves and has its being in God. It is the form in which the personal creature lives consciously and hence *freely* in the divine authority.

II. But the life of man is not merely natural, it is also civil. The social relation is as essential to the development of human life as the natural. Hence we take our second illustration from the true idea of civil government, or the state. This is usually defined to be "a body of persons united together in one community for the defence of their rights"—"a whole people united

into one body politic"—"a civil power,"—"a civil community"—"a commonwealth," "a social compact."

The ends of state government are usually regarded as merely temporary, such as the defence of property, of life, and rights. In this way it is very common, and very convenient too, to distinguish it from the Church, or the ecclesiastical power which has to do with man's spiritual and eternal interests.

By some indeed the state government is regarded simply as a human structure, a sort of breast-work thrown up by the hands of man for his defence against himself. "It is a human invention, a machinery which man must learn to use to his own advantage."* The people according to this shallow view make the laws sure enough. They make them to suit themselves, to suit their own interests, their own advantage. *They* make their own civil officers, and will have them do their bidding.

Such is the teaching of modern politicians, and such is the teaching to an alarming extent of the modern pulpit. It is of course popular, and for this very reason a sad comment upon popular sentiment.

The view is a misconception of civil liberty altogether, and if carried out to its consequences would make us a nation of infidels, and our government an absolute poly-archy; worse even than an anarchy. We pronounce it therefore, without the least hesitation, heretical and dangerous. Such teaching coming from the pulpit is a disgrace to the pulpit, and a sad comment upon the religious sentiment that receives it with favor. The civil government "a human machinery"! a Yankee invention in successful operation under the improved skill of the Nineteenth century.

According to this view the state, as Cicero would express it, is a mere structure upon the waters. It is in a state of constant flux. It does not maintain for a single day, a fixed identity. It is a ship at the mercy of the winds and the waves. The very next popular wind that blows against it may sink it to the bottom of the ocean. But whether the popular gale be favorable or adverse, what becomes of true civil freedom in any

* See Beecher's Sermon: "Moral theory of civil liberty."

case? If the civil law be nothing more than the aggregate of the popular will, standing as it stands, changing as it changes, how can it either give or defend freedom? Suppose the popular will be itself unfree, blinded by ignorance and enslaved by passion, can it then give freedom? Or suppose the aggregate of that will be intelligent and free, by what power does it maintain its freedom, and whence does it obtain the right to give out its will as civil law? Has it this power or this right in itself? Has the majority any more right to rule a minority than one man has to rule the multitudes? If the citizens are older than the state, and if they with their own hands have put up the structure; if it be a self-constituted thing, it may also destroy itself at will. If it be a mere social compact, a partnership entered into for mutual advantage, why may not that compact be broken as soon as each individual may form the conceit that it would be for his benefit to set up for himself? What right then has the one part to coerce the other part? What right, according to this theory, had our government to thrash the south, because they wished to withdraw from the union?

The Scriptural view of the State is entirely different from this. St. Paul declares, in unmistakable words, that the civil government is a "power ordained of God." It is a *divine* institution! it is the necessary and specific form under which human life, in its manifold departments, is developed and actualized. As Hagel has expressed it, "the State is the actualness of the moral idea, the divine will present in the actual form and organization of a world-unfolding spirit."

It is the entire human family organized, animated, and bound together by a common and specific law, giving form and character to all individual human life. And as man lives and has his being in God, this law must necessarily be the divine will. The general goes before the particular. The State is older than the human individual. It is the relation into which every man is born. The idea must needs precede its actualization. This turns the table entirely. Instead of man's making the State, the State makes him. Instead of his making the law, he is made by the law and under the law. It is the plastic power of his whole life. He is created in it, he lives in

He is subject, and not lord and king. Men might as well undertake to make suns and moons, and to hang up lamps on the ceiling of the natural heavens, as to undertake to construct and run "the machinery (so called) of civil government."

The all comprehensive State organization may take different forms. It may take the monarchical, the aristocratic, or the republican form. This does not alter the case. It is still a power ordained of God; it is still a *divine* government. It has of course its outward form, its human side. It is allied to nature. It has its temporal ends to subserve. But these are not its highest ends, and are not to be placed in opposition to its internal side or spirit. Its end is the well-being, the freedom of the subject; his internal and external freedom. This end it gains by actualizing its own idea. When in the State organization law reigns supreme, when its love principle is apprehended in its deepest ground, when the whole is apprehended as a power ordained of God, then the citizens are free, and only then. The State, as a divine institution, is the only ground of civil freedom. No other ground has yet been discovered; no other *can* be discovered. There *is* no other. There may be preferences for one form of government and objections to another form. Some may prefer the monarchical, and others the republican. The actual reigning sovereignty may be in a king or in the people; but when it is forgotten that the ultimate sovereignty is in God, and that the proximate is actually a *vicegerency*, there is no freedom. It is not the *form* of government, as chosen by the people, that secures their liberties. This form may suit their tastes exactly, and they may imagine that they have discovered a machinery that works admirably, yet it may not give them freedom, nor are they free in its use. Where the divine idea of civil government dies out in a community or nation, there the government becomes absolute, no matter what may be its form. There may be an absolute republic as well as an absolute monarchy. The popular will may tyrannize as well as the individual will. The true ground of freedom is fundamental law as such, which exists in the world as the true representative of the Majesty

in the heavens, governing alike the governing and the governed.

In the State organization the relation of civil magistrate and citizen must of course exist; but it is divinely established. The king may have come to the throne by inheritance, or the President may have been elected by the people, the coronation in the one case, and the inauguration in the other are investitures in *divine office*. The civil magistrate is a minister of God. He bears the sword not merely of utilitarian, but of vindicatory justice. The civil rulers of our government, we are aware, are regarded as the servants of the people, because elected by them. But if they are their servants, they are poor miserable creatures indeed. No! let such *low* and INFIDEL view be foreign. The civil ruler is God's vicegerent, and to *Him* he is accountable, and not to the people. What a relief and comfort to good citizens; how freely they breathe, when assured that their rulers are not time-servers; that they will do "just what is right," regardless of popular opinion. "Happy are the people who are in such a case." Now, we know from the history of nations, that the following cases are possible:

a. The king or ruler may be a good man. He may fill his office in God's name and fear. The government may be rightly administered; but the people are bad and rebellious. They have forgotten God, and do not fear Him. They have no reverence for civil law and authority as such. The true idea of the State organization has died out among them. In their view the king is no more than another man; hence the civil law has lost its authority, it has no force, no power to regulate. In this case the people are not free.

b. The ruler may be a bad man, a usurper, a tyrant! and the citizens may be good. If not loyal to the crown, at least law-loving and law-abiding. But being under a tyrannical rule, they are not free.

c. The ruler and the ruled may be bad. There may be either an agreement or disagreement of will and sentiment. But in this case the whole national mind and will are "*anomoi*."

The whole body politic is diseased; there is no soundness in it, and hence of course there is no freedom.

d. The ruler and a part of the people may be good and loyal, and a part may be bad and disloyal. In this case there will be a disturbance in the State organism. There will be a conflict; hostility and war may be the result. In this case the people are in danger, and hence not free. In all the cases named thus far there is disturbance in the body politic. There is disease. Hence the government does not gain its end; it does not give and secure freedom.

e. The rulers and the ruled, finally, may both be good. In this case the reigning State sovereignty answers to the ultimate sovereignty. It is its expression, the form of its actualization. The will of the king or ruler is the will of God. The vicegerency is true to its trust, it is real. All municipal regulations and legislative enactments are in agreement with fundamental law. They are the form indeed in which this law develops its principle and life in the State organism, giving it health and vigor. The civil authority is the divine authority apprehending, holding together in one community, and governing the citizens. They in turn apprehend that by which they are apprehended. They love the king and the kingdom, not from motives of temporal interest, but from principle. They love the law for its own sake; they reverence and obey their rulers, not as men, but as the representatives of the King of kings and Lord of lords. They are consciously in law, and delight in it. It is not a yoke, it is not a burden. Its authority is not the stern command of a foreign king, but the friendly voice of a parent. In a word, the law is love, and love in them is its fulfilment. It is hardly necessary to state that the citizens of such a community are free, and prosperous. They have a country, they have a nation, and this nation has its history. It has gathered up the wealth and treasures of past ages. It has fallen heir to the world's literature, its fine arts, its reminiscences, its wisdom, and these are really all its own. It has also fallen heir to the gifts of nature! the kingdom of nature is tributary to this kingdom. In such a govern-

ment, or nation, the people are not strangers, they are at home, they are sons; and hence they are of course free.

But their freedom is not lawlessness by any means. It is not the privilege of the people to do as they list. Nor is the government a social compact formed from motives of interest with which they happen to be well pleased, because it is a PROFITABLE copartnership. The civil law is the very ground, the principle, and the essential factor of their freedom. They will as the State wills, and this wills as God wills, and hence they will freely. The individual will has the general State law, the general law of humanity, as its contents. As individual human life can only hold in its concrete connection with the general life of the race, and this again as it is in God, so the individual will can only be will really and truly; that is, it can only be intelligent and free in the general law and authority of the State as a power ordained of God. This, we maintain, is the only ground of freedom, and only he is the free citizen who has discovered this ground and stands upon it. Let us take, for illustration, the national flag; the flag of our own national government. We now see it lifted up and given to the breeze. It waves triumphantly over the gilded arches of our recently endangered, but now consummated Union. We love that flag, not merely because it is "red, white and blue," not simply because it is a "star-spangled banner," we love it as the symbol, the emblem and pledge of our national freedom; and as we look upon it we cannot help but pray: "*Long* may it wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave." Can we expect this prayer to be answered without any reference to the staff which supports the flag? Must it not be upheld by the strong arm of the law? Must it not be defended by the royal power of authority? It is indeed a symbol of freedom, but freedom IN law and authority.

Nor is it freedom in a State authority that is disconnected with the ultimate sovereignty, as though God, after He had organized the State, had withdrawn His presence from it, or as though the right to rule had been given once for all coming time. The Lord, we maintain, is a factor of the world's his-

tory. The necessary relation of human society was ordained by Him in the form of the State organism, and from Him it derives all its life and power, as from a perennial fountain. He did not only build the ship of State; He is also in the ship to guide it across the ocean of time. By *Him* kings reign and decree justice. They are the vicegerents, not of a far distant monarch, but of the ever present Lord, who is concealed from outward view only by the thin veil of sense. The State authority, we repeat, is the divine authority in this specific form. This is the omnipotent arm that upholds the flag of civil freedom. This is the sure protection of individual life, of personal property and rights.

Here a friend looks over our shoulder, and remarks: "All true, but be careful that you do not carry out your view so far as to make the State organization a mystical body, like the Church, in virtue of such vital relation to its head." If the view be correct, it must be carried out, let it lead us where it will. That by the way is a sickly prudence indeed that would caution us against following the truth, lest it might introduce us into company that is not very popular.

To say right out that the relation between the Lord, who is King over all, and the State is vital, and that it is a mystical body in virtue of such vital relation, does not by any means confound the true idea of the State with that of the Church. We have said that the Lord is Mediator *per se*, that He is the personal love-bond between the Creator and the works which He has made, that the whole creation is an organism; but this does not destroy the idea of specific difference. It is the ground rather in which all such difference holds. We have spoken of the kingdom of nature as a form of the divine government, and of natural freedom as the result; and now we have spoken of the State as another form of the divine government, and as the only true ground of civil freedom.

The abnormal history of the world proves the correctness of this view, as well as the normal civil relation which we have supposed. Darkness presupposes light, error presupposes

truth, so the abnormal implies the normal. The wickedness of wicked kings appears as wickedness, and is punished in virtue of the divine authority enshrined in the State government. The Lord reigns in this form. Thrones totter and fall. Dynasties are changed. The Lord dethrones kings, and puts others in their stead; and all this He does not in an outward or arbitrary way; but by asserting and vindicating the awful majesty of His law as incorporated in the State. It is just this internal and necessary connection between the reigning and ultimate State sovereignty that St. Paul had in view, when he delivered that memorable exhortation that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority. 1 Tim. ii. 2. The reason and encouragement given, is the fact that there is "one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." Kings stand between God and man, it is true; yet there is but *one* Mediator, and the civil governments, with their kings and rulers, are but a form of His mediatorship. For we must not forget that Christ, as mediator, is King and Lord to rule, as well as High Priest, to atone for sin, and Prophet to instruct. According to this view, then, the State is allied to the moral and spiritual world. It is designed to discipline and educate man for a higher state of being. It is a specific form, in which the powers of the everlasting kingdom have come down to earth, that they might apprehend the children of men, and lift them up into the state of their final destiny. It is designed, of course, to secure and perpetuate freedom here; but not that its holy flame may be smothered in the grave; but that, like a friendly spirit, it may lead us through the dark valley and shadow of death into the land of final rest and peace—the land of *perfect* freedom.

III. Since, however, the human family is affected by sin, since the great state-organism is diseased, its divinely ordained powers cannot of themselves effect that for which they were designed. The divine authority, therefore, apprehends the human spirit by a still higher form, in which are comprehended the powers of a *new* creation. "What the law" (whether

natural, civil or moral) "could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." What shall we say, then, in regard to the relation of Christ's kingdom to the kingdom of nature and to the civil powers that be? The end of His coming into the world is here declared to be the fulfilment of the righteousness of the law in us, and in the same chapter is contained the wonderful prophecy, that the whole creation, which was made subject to vanity, and groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

The fulfilment of the righteousness of the law, then, whatever may have been the form of its revelation, in the children of men is their liberty, and into this glorious liberty the kingdom of nature shall be delivered. Freedom of the creature, the personal and impersonal creature in virtue of their organic union, is here obviously declared to be the end of redemption through Christ. Shall we infer from this that Christianity is merely remedial, and that after it has lifted the curse from nature, and restored man fully to his normal relations, its specific and distinctive form, namely, that of the Church, will be given up, and its life absorbed in the general life of the State? This is the view of Hagel, Rothe and others. That the philosopher, whose religion all resolves itself ultimately into morality, should, from his stand-point, hold this view, is quite natural. The State perfected, the State as the full and complete actualization of the "moral idea," is, according to this view, the highest conceivable form of human life. Then, of course, after all the moral agencies used to bring about the final consummation of all things have accomplished their work, they will be no longer needed. The Church, as a moral power in the world, will then no longer need a distinct organization; her laity will have become mere citizens, and her offices and powers will be identified with those of the State. From the

moral stand-point, we say, this view is quite natural. The Church, in the mean time, may be used by the State, as in most of the European kingdoms at the present day, as a sort of police system, to keep the masses in order. But when she is no longer needed for this purpose, the heavy taxes to keep up the Church establishment can be saved. . . .

In this view we can only speak of natural, and civil or moral freedom, as the natural and moral kingdoms are the only forms in which the human spirit is apprehended by the divine law.

That a Theologian, who occupies the Christological stand-point, as for instance Professor Rothe, should hold this view, is to us unaccountable, except on the ground of inconsequence or inconsistency. If the Son of God has really come in the flesh, and if in consequence "the kingdom of *heaven* is at hand," this kingdom must have its divinely ordained powers, specifically different from those of the State. The new creation in Christ Jesus develops the law of its own peculiar life: and just as in the sphere of nature it is impossible for one kingdom to develop into another, as for instance, the mineral into the vegetable, or the vegetable into the animal, so it is impossible for the Church to develop into the State, or the State into the Church. The history of the one may condition the history of the other. Like the vegetable and animal kingdoms, they may occupy the same territory. The one may minister to the well-being of the other. The members of the one may even be members of the other; yet in idea, in principle and in the forms of their development, they are distinct and specifically different. We may therefore with propriety speak of religious or Christian freedom, just as we do of natural and moral freedom. All depends upon our correct view of Christianity. Has it come to us in the way of a historical process, or has it not? Is it organic? Or is it a mere spiritual influence felt by each individual for himself? Is it a new creation *per se?* Or is it merely a divine influence at work to cure the evils that affect the old creation? Has Christ really a mystical body? Or are Christians merely His disciples in an outward way? Is Christianity really churchly, or is it not? It must either be

the one or the other. The Church is either the body of Christ, the "fullness of Him that filleth all in all," as declared by St. Paul, or this scripture is untrue. Here, by the way, we take this opportunity of correcting a very great mistake. During the discussion of the Church question within the last twenty-five or thirty years, whilst we have been insisting on a more churchly piety and more churchly views, we have been speaking and writing all along as though there were really an unchurchly Christianity; and the question really has been: "Which is the best, the churchly or the unchurchly?" This, we say, is a great mistake. THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNCHURCHLY CHRISTIANITY. There is no fact that has ever been more fully sustained by observation than this fact, namely, that a falling away from the faith in the Holy Catholic Church is a falling away from Christ. "No Church, no Christ," is as true practically as it is theologically. The unchurchly sects of our time and of our country are a melancholy proof of this truth. It will of course be regarded as very uncharitable to deny to them the Christian name. They say continually: "Lo, here is Christ, and lo, there is Christ;" but have they Christ really? They have their emotions, their views of the Bible, their piety, and so on; but have they really the Christian piety? Do their endlessly conflicting views, their rivalry, their bigotry, their worship, and their general practice, evince the spirit of Christ? Is this the religious liberty that Christ gives? Is it really His will that the Holy Bible, the written word of God, which takes its whole character from the incarnate Word, should be made to teach a thousand contradictory things? Is this religious, we mean Christian, freedom, that sects may multiply at will, and that each individual may have the right of private judgment and private practice, regardless of all Church law or authority? This we are told is Protestantism, and it must either be this or Roman Catholicism. "This is the solution of the great problem of religious freedom." If this be so, good Lord deliver us from it. It is not Christianity; it is not the Christian freedom. It is lawlessness of the worst kind. So furious and wild is this lawless mass of "*intelligent*" individuals, that

they never stop to ask the question: On what ground has every man the right to interpret the Bible for himself, and to be a Christian for himself, independently of the united wisdom of the Church? Or if here and there you meet with one who does stop to ask this question, he will answer it by telling you: "God loves us all alike, He has given every man a Bible, and to God every man is directly accountable, and not to man, and not to the Church, which is but a human institution." He will say further: "Religion is spiritual; the Spirit of God apprehends the spirit of each individual, and makes him a Christian according to his own idiosyncrasy."

The Christian freedom, according to this fancy, is the privilege of each individual to go to heaven in his own balloon —in the balloon of his own subjectivity; for a real balloon is objective, and cannot be prepared by any one without the aid of his fellow-men. There is in fact nothing in God's universe with which this fancy can be compared. We had thought its extreme folly might be illustrated by a fable of the leaves of the forest, who had a consultation about their freedom. As they enjoyed very much the influence of the wind, and were refreshed by it time after time, they expressed a united wish that they might be no longer bound by the general law of nature, which has produced each leaf and holds it in its place. They prayed that they might be freed from this bond, so that they could go from place to place at pleasure. But when their prayer was answered, they all withered and died, and fell to the ground. But this is a mere fable. It would be a slander to suppose that the leaves of the forest, held in lovely union and communion, could offer such a prayer. "The intelligent" of the Nineteenth century, who have discovered that the Church is a mere human institution, that all ecclesiasticism is priestcraft, and that all faith in the Church as a divine historical institution is popery, are alone entitled to the honor of being in advance "in the march of freedom," individual freedom, not in organic Christian law, but separated from it. We say, let them take all the honor and all the pleasure of this

kind of freedom. Go forward in the march, each sect by itself, and each individual by himself. Fight the great adversary of souls each in his own way; you will know best how to do it. Make your own creed, your own laws, and have everything just your own way. Yes, let sectism and individualism, since we have them, reign. But, is this the reign of Christian freedom? Is it not the freedom of the withered leaf? Is it not the freedom of the surging waves of the dead sea? These are still under law; we must therefore ask once more, is not this the freedom of the foolish virgins, who are excluded from the kingdom of heavenly glory because they failed to secure oil for the vessels of their lamps according to the established law of the kingdom of grace? It is nothing else. *It is a grand delusion.*

Since the development of human life, in all its stages, is abnormal, since the depravity of human nature is total, since sin has become historical, the Christian religion, as soteriological power, must needs be historical likewise. A mere spiritual or moral influence from above, however powerful it might be, could not save. The Word must really be made flesh, the Son of God must really become the son of man. And the incarnation fact must hold for all coming time. As the abnormal development started in the first Adam, the normal development must needs start in the second Adam. And as the first has been going forward in the way of historical process, the second must needs go forward in the same way. Redemption, to be complete, must be as broad and deep as humanity. So it is in fact. Christianity is the absolute religion, answering to every conceivable want of our nature. It is life and power, and must of course, as all life, have its own peculiar form of development. It *is* organic, and like the State organism, it has its external and internal sides. It is the supernatural order of *grace* in the natural. This is the form in which the heavenly powers come to us and apprehend us: they come in the form of an objective, historical institution, that is, in the form of the Christian Church. This is "the body of Christ, the FULL-

NESS of Him that filleth all in all." This is the form in which the Lord reigns graciously and mediatorially. The kingdom of nature, as we have seen, is a form also of the Lord's mediatorial reign, and the State organism is another specific form of the same divine reign; but neither in nature nor in the State does the Lord reign graciously. What we mean by the Lord's mediatorial rule in the form of nature and the State, is simply this, that human life does not hold in Him *immediately*, but *mediately*. He sustains life through natural means, and in the relation which we designate the State He rules in the form of vicegerency, *i. e.*, mediately.

In the Church, the Lord reigns both as Mediator and as Saviour. Here He graciously communicates His own life in regeneration, He forgives sins, justifies, and sanctifies. Here, in a word, He is Redeemer. He redeems from sin, He redeems unto life.

The natural, or State life, can never become a saving power. As a form of divine authority, it apprehends the human spirit, and demands of it obedience; but it cannot give the power to obey; it cannot regenerate its subjects; and hence cannot make them free. In the form, however, of the Christian Church, the divine authority so apprehends the human spirit as to communicate to it the principle and power of obedience. Hence in the Church alone is to be found true religious freedom. Not the freedom of the anti-nomian, nor the freedom of the separatist, nor the freedom of the unsacramental hosts of God's non-elect, where, in each case, the binding power is individual caprice or party arbitrariness.

Christian freedom, we say, stands in Church authority. Here the principle of authority, in Christ Jesus, is the very principle of free obedience. It is born in the subjects of the kingdom of grace, and is really their own. It is the holy love-bond which unites them to their glorified Head, and at the same time unites them together as children of the same family; it is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which "makes us free from the law of sin and death." This "Spirit of life" is indeed the Spirit of adoption, by which we call God our

Father, and by which we are owned as His children, and if children, then free.

But the Church, we know, is *one*, *holy*, and Catholic. Her authority, therefore, cannot apprehend the human spirit in contradictory forms. There may be diversity, but there cannot be contradiction. We can conceive, for instance, that the ecclesiastical government may, in the development of the Church, take different forms; the Episcopal, the Papal, and the Presbyterian, answering to the different forms of State government; but in no case must it be self-contradictory. To prove itself to be divine, it must needs maintain its identity. As the Church herself cannot fail, or lose her identity, she cannot give up the principle of authority. This is essential to her unity. There must needs be an Episcopate, an overseership, an eldership (for the New Testament episcopos, and presbuteros mean the same thing); but whether it be vested in one or many persons in any given period of the Church's history, does not, we think, affect the apostolical succession. It is for the divine succession itself we contend. Without it the unity of the Church is destroyed, and Christianity must prove a failure. The principle of Church authority unfolded in her constitution is that by which she settled the sacred canon itself; it is that by which she ordains ministers; it is that by which she determines what is scriptural and what is not; and it is at once obvious that if this principle were not divine, the Church could not long exist. But we must not conceive of the Church's authority as a distinctive principle unfolding itself in her bosom. It is the form rather in which the *whole* Church, as an objective institution of the means of divine grace, apprehends the human spirit. In virtue of her mystical union with her glorified Head, *all* her means of grace are divinely appointed, and those who administer them are clothed with divine authority. They bear in their hands the keys of the kingdom, and "what they bind on earth is bound in heaven, and what they loose on earth is loosed in heaven." They preach with divine authority; they are the very ambassadors of Christ; they administer the sacraments in His name and in His stead. In this consists the validity of

the sacraments, and not upon the subjective condition of either the minister or of those to whom he ministers. In the divine authority, as thus objectively revealed in the Church, we say true freedom stands. On this holy ground the principle of authority and subjective freedom are found to be identical. In love the Saviour reigns in the kingdom of His grace, and in love the subjects of His kingdom obey. They are here consciously in Christ, the personal love-bond, which holds them in the free communion of the saints of all ages and countries—the blessed communion of all the saints with the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

But the Church is also Catholic, and as such she is destined to sanctify *all* the relations of human life. The redemption offered in this form is full and complete. The human relation, which we have designated "*the natural*," is not destroyed by any means, by the power of Christianity; but it is sanctified, changed from the abnormal into the normal. The curse is removed from nature. "The creature," that is, the creation, "is delivered from the bondage of corruption," and this deliverance is at once its elevation "into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

So, too, the relation which we have designated "the State," is sanctified. This includes, of course, the family relation; because the State is only the family amplified. Whilst, in the nature of the case, the State cannot become the form of the Church's life, the organizations being essentially distinct, it is equally true that the State cannot be superseded by the Church. Yet they are so related, that the civil relation is sanctified by the Church, and is elevated into her own sphere. Christianity sanctifies every thing by its hallowed touch, and baptizes it in its own name. It secures to the citizen the freedom, the civil freedom we mean, which the State authority of itself could not give.

The divine authority, as we have shown, apprehends the human spirit in the form of the natural and civil governments, to the end that it may be free; but in themselves they are mere binding power, essentially necessary to the end in view it

is true, yet not adequate. The apprehending power, in the form of the new creation in Christ Jesus, *enables* the human spirit to apprehend that by which it is apprehended. It enables it to apprehend not only the powers of the new creation itself, but also the powers of the old creation in their relation to the new. They are free indeed whom Christ makes free as His subjects in the kingdom of nature, as His subjects in the kingdom of State, and as His subjects in the higher kingdom of His grace. They are free in all these relations, just because in Christ they are children of God, children in whom the divine law, in whatever forms it may have been revealed, has come to its fulfilment as the law of love. When in the end they come to apprehend fully as they are apprehended, when they shall know even as they are known in the kingdom of glory, their freedom will be complete.

"Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly." Amen.

ART. IV.—ANTHROPOLOGICAL STATISTICS.*

BY LEWIS H. STEINER.

GUYOT in his little treatise on "Earth and Man" has shown that the geographical and spiritual centre of the human race was Western Asia, "and that the degradation of man was possible from the very fact that he was free, of a perfectible nature, and consequently capable also of falling. In the path of development, not to advance is to go back; it is impossible to remain stationary." Man who should grow in perfection by the constant exercise of the higher faculties of his nature, by struggling against the evil inclinations of a perverted will,—man descends evermore, and proceeds from fall to fall, if he neglects those divine gifts, and abandons himself to the low instincts of

* Investigations on the Military and Anthropological Statistics of American Soldiers. By Benjamin Apthorp Gould, Ph. D., Actuary to the U. S. Sanitary Commission. Hurd and Houghton, 1869. 655 pages, 8vo.

his animal nature. He goes down to the life of the brute, whose form and semblance he takes. And what will come to pass if, separated from his God, and forgetting Him, he voluntarily stops the sources of the higher life, and moral life? Remote from the sources of tradition, where he might renew the temper of his faith, he remains unarmed with that mighty nature that subjugates him; he yields in the struggle, and vanquished, *bears soon upon his figure the ineffaceable mark of bondage.* Thus, perhaps, might one, I do not say explain, but conceive, the incontestable influence of each continent, and each region of the earth, on the *physical* forms, the character and the temperament of the man who dwells in it, and the degeneracy of his type in proportion as he is removed from the place of his origin, and the focus of his religious traditions. Renouncing moral liberty, which exists only in goodness, man gives to nature power over himself, submits to it, and thus are traced and distinguished, a race of Eastern Asia, an African race, an Australian race, a Polynesian race, an American race. Necessarily this transformation must have taken place early in the history of mankind, and "the origin of the human races is a fact beyond our observation and anterior to all history, and, like all other origins, is screened by an impenetrable veil."

In the changes, physical and mental, referred to by the author quoted, the influences of climate and other agencies incident to man's terrestrial location have slowly and imperceptibly, but none the less certainly, exercised a mighty power. Hence wherever these influences are most favorable to physical development we should find the best evidences of activity, energy and high intellectuality,—all, however, kept from attaining their highest form, when a recognition of Christianity and its wonderful power of raising man above the mere sphere of the animal, is absent. "We are subject to the influences of climate and the other agencies of geographical location, just as we are possessed by virtue of our animal nature of certain passions and proclivities; by the power of grace, however, we are enabled to keep our souls, despite these influences and tendencies, free from a downward tendency, thanks to Him who was a man like

us in all respects, save sin, and who has granted unto all men the power of resisting the world, the flesh and the devil, and the inestimable privilege of brotherhood with Him in the Father's family."

All the geographical advantages needed for the due development of the physical man are found in North America, especially in the United States. Physical geography has shown us its fitness "to play a part in the history of humanity, very different indeed from that of Asia and Europe, but not less glorious, not less useful to all mankind." Still the people or rather peoples, here busy in the drama of life are not autocthonous. They have been driven hither by persecution—hoping to find liberty of conscience as regards the form of worship they deem most suited to their religious views; by want and suffering from the crowded villages of Ireland or the teeming cities of the continent,—anxious to acquire food, clothing and shelter for themselves and their loved ones; by political proscription,—fleeing from the hard blows of tyranny or aristocracy to seek that freedom which recognizes man for *his own* worth, and does not stamp a value upon him on account of brave or honored ancestry; by adventure—wearied with the monotonous routine into which their native lands have insensibly fallen and the tiresome want of novelty that belongs to countries bearing the impress of man's power and genius all over them, to find that which shall challenge all the daring and courage possessed by an adventurous spirit; by love of gain,—despairing of success where every avenue to wealth is thronged with myriads of toilers, to carve out for themselves new roads to success and wealth. And this motley current of emigrants, increasing in size and numbers with each succeeding year, has poured into our ports, and thence spread itself over the wide territory of the United States, losing its original peculiarities with the lapse of years and the imperceptible action of geographical conditions, has constituted what we know as the American people. Differing in origin, manner, customs, religions, these people have fused together and formed —not a new *race* (that is the business of centuries) but a new people, taking a high rank among the first powers of the earth.

It would be an interesting subject to set forth the curious results of this mongrel emigration as regards mental and religious developments. Naturally all the excesses in both metaphysics and religion, that might be caused by a sudden transference from slavish subordination to authority, to a region where freedom has a tendency to riotous disregard of authority, would be found here. The school of Paine here finds its followers, the devotee of spiritualism his numerous companions, materialism its host of friends and supporters, and Brigham Young his thousands of deluded and misguided subjects. But here also, notwithstanding the erratic types it sometimes assumes, religion has its humble, faithful supporters, whose lives bear abundant evidence to their practical recognition of the universal brotherhood of believers and the claims of unconverted man upon them for instruction in those truths that make for his eternal welfare. But, however interesting such a subject might be to the student of mankind, our task at present is something simpler. We propose simply to look at some of the physical aspects of our people, restricting our article to such as have been noted more peculiarly of the male sex between the ages of 18 and 45, drawing our materials from the excellent monograph that has been prepared by the patient student and eminent astronomer, Dr. B. A. Gould, after an exhaustive study of facts accumulated by the inspectors of the Sanitary Commission during our recent war for the preservation of the Union. It will be understood that whatever results are presented by Dr. G., have been obtained from a consideration of males fit for military duty, that is free from indications of serious bodily or mental infirmity,

From the first call issued by President Lincoln in 1861 for seventy thousand men, to the end of the war, the number of army enlistments was 2,480,000 whites, of which 1,523,267 were known to be native born citizens, 53,532 British Americans, 45,508 English, 144,221 Irish, 176,817 Germans. These figures serve to show that the composition of the army was largely made up of native Americans, and it is fair to presume that a considerable portion of those who claimed foreign birth were naturalized citizens. The total number of deaths during

service was about 250,000, and of casualties 858,000, "making the ratio of deaths to the whole number of casualties as 100 to 343."

Age of Volunteers. An investigation has been made on this point of 1,012,263 enlisted men, and 37,184 commissioned officers, of whom $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the men, and $3\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. of the officers were not between the ages of 18 and 45. Taking away from the number of men, those not included within the military limits, we get the following facts;

	Years.
Average age at last birthday,	25.325
" " at time of enlistment,	25.8083
Of the age of 18 there were	13.27 per cent.
under 21 " "	29.52
" 25 " "	58.34
" 30 " "	76.57

Taking away from the number of officers, those not included within the military limits, and we get a remainder of 35,953; and their average age at last birthday was 29.8338 years.

The facts thus far presented are of value in showing the magnitude of the army, and the average age of the men composing it, but they are only preliminary to the physical data which now claim our attention.

Height. The height of nearly a million and a quarter of men was obtained, and the average of the white soldiers was 67.639 inches. In discussing the heights as compared with ages the following inferences have been obtained:

"1. That the rate of growth undergoes a sudden diminution at about the age of twenty years, the increase of stature continuing nevertheless uninterruptedly until about the age of twenty-four. 2. That for a year or two after this latter epoch the height remains nearly stationary, if indeed it does not diminish, after which a slight increase again manifests itself, and continues until the full stature is attained. 3. That the normal epoch of maximum stature must generally be placed, at least for American States, as late as thirty years, but that it varies for different classes of men."

As regards the third inference it was found that the maximum height was attained at 31 years for native Americans and Irish, while the Germans, seem to reach the same at twenty-three. It was found, moreover, that there were "agencies connected with the State furnishing the men"—that is the State in which they resided—which had some effect upon stature. Those from the Western States were taller than the Eastern soldiers. But latitude seems to exert no influence upon stature, nor is it a distinctive characteristic of nationality. It is also proven that it does not depend to any great degree upon domestic circumstances, or elevation of the district inhabited, inasmuch as while the tallest men in Kentucky, Tennessee and West Virginia were from the Alleghanies, yet men of great height were also furnished by the prairies of Indiana and Illinois. The tallest man in the army was an Indiana lieutenant, who measured 82½ inches, and the shortest an Ohio private, who was only 40 inches.

Color of hair, eyes, and complexion. In every 1000 men, there were 306 with brown hair, 250 dark, 235 light, 136 black, 37 sandy, 26 red, and 10 gray; 449 had blue eyes, 243 gray, 128 hazel, 104 dark, and 76 black; and 608 had light complexion, 324 dark, and 68 medium.

Occupations. In every 1000 men, 487 had been engaged in agriculture, 252 in mechanical pursuits, 35 in commerce, 16 were professional men, 6 printers, 163 laborers, and 41 had followed miscellaneous pursuits. Here we see that nearly one half of our soldiers had been drawn from among the tillers of the soil, and the inference is a fair one that the latter bear about that proportion to the entire male population of our country between the ages of 18 and 45.

Physical statistics. The value of these depends upon our recognition of the existence of typical ideas as entities and not mere abstractions. Each individual is an effort at the full attainment of such an idea, which owing to a thousand perturbating causes he may not attain in some or many particulars. If, however, we examine a sufficient number of individuals, "under circumstances sufficiently varied, we may arrive at a knowledge of the

form and dimensions of the ideal, typical plant, or animal or man,—to which all individuals are approximations." The sculptor gets his ideal human form not from any one human being he has actually seen, but from a close examination of many, whose symmetry and grace have been duly examined and closely scanned. The greater the number of these and the more accurate his observation of the points of salient beauty, the better will his preparation be for the representation of the typical form towards which *all* are striving, and which none wholly attain. The naturalist in like manner describes genera, species and varieties,—from a typical idea which has gradually manifested itself to his mind, as he has cleared away from his conceptions those peculiarities that are accidental or indications of abnormal growth, which typical idea is as real an existence as any truth in mathematics or metaphysics. Of course by real we mean true, and the latter idea is not confined to sensuous representations. All nature is in fact laboring after the representation of typical ideas which it never fully and perfectly accomplishes.

Dr. Gould says, "We may hope to discover the type of humanity, as well as the types of the several classes and races of man. In the present research we are only dealing with some of his external physical manifestations, but we may aim at the deduction of the numerical expressions of these as a step toward constructing the typical or average man, who, though probably never clad in flesh, is yet a reality, not merely existing in the divine mind, but capable of perception and recognition by human sense." "The average man," says Quetelet, "is for a nation what the centre of gravity is for a body; to the consideration of this are referred all the phenomena of equilibrium."

The inspectors of physical condition accumulated full statistics relative to the dimensions and other peculiarities of some 25,000 men, thus furnishing more materials for study than had ever been collected before in the world. These have all been tabulated, carefully examined so as to detect probable error on the part of the observer, thoroughly arranged and discussed by Gould and his assistants. The instruments employed to secure

the dimensions were the andrometer, devised by McDonald of Edinburgh for the determination of total height, breadth of neck, of shoulders and of pelvis, the length of legs and height to the knees, and the height of the body proper; the spirometer, to determine the capacity of lungs; the dynamometer, for determinations of muscular strength; the platform balance for weight; the facial-angle instrument, calipers and measuring tape. An examination was also made of the students attending our two largest literary institutions, Harvard and Yale, for the purpose of comparison.

"The characteristic differences between the races are in general shown by the *relative* dimensions more distinctly than by the actual ones; those dissimilarities which are due to differences in general size disappearing, while those which actually exist in the type are made more prominent." We cannot linger, in our hasty notice of Gould's labors, over the chapter on *mean dimensions*, although it may be well to say that some popular notions, as regards the simple ratios existing between different parts of the human body, are thoroughly set aside. "The average span of the extended arms uniformly *exceeds* the height; the height to the pubes *surpasses* half the stature (hence discrepancy in height is not fully recognized when men are sitting down but only when in an erect position); the mean distance between the nipples is always *less* than one-fourth the circumference of the chest, &c." It has always been the dream of certain minds that such *simple* numerical ratios exist in nature. Astronomers have dreamed over it, chemists have claimed its discovery in the atomic weights of the elements, and artists its existence in the human frame. The existence of numerical ratios is fixed, no work shows it more clearly than the present, but we have failed to find it in what we call *whole* numbers.

After discussing at some length the mean proportions of the body, he arrives at some general conclusions which are specially worthy of preservation: "The distance between the eyes increases in the following order—1, student; 2, sailor; 3, soldier; 4, Indian; 5, mulatto; 6, negro. For the length of foot, we have the sequence—1, student; 2, Indian; 3, soldier; 4,

sailor; 5, mulatto; 6, negro. In length of body the red man is pre-eminent; in length of legs, the negro; and in both these races the arms are longer than in the white." In play of chest the order increases as follows: 1, mulatto; 2, negro; 3 Indian; 4, white.

The mean facial angle was as follows for white soldiers and sailors, 72°.082; students, 73°.874; negroes, 68°.857; mulattoes, 69°.233; Indians 72°.864. The greatest facial angle was observed in two sailors, from England and Ireland, being 86°.7,—and the least in an Irish soldier, 55.°0.

The ratio of weight to stature is given in one table in the number of pounds to the inch of stature, and is as follows: students, 2.001; blacks, 2.183; mulattoes, 2.185; Indians, 2.384.

As regards "the mean lifting strength, it varies from about $2\frac{1}{4}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the weight, so that in general a man can lift considerably more than twice his own weight."

But we are unable to follow our author through the chapters treating of pulmonary capacity, respiration and pulse, vision, miscellaneous characteristics, and military service. They are full of materials for careful investigation and close scrutiny. Its author has added to his past laurels by the ability he has shown in systematizing the almost frightful mass of statistics that were wisely submitted to him by the Commission. The stern logic of mathematics has been strictly employed in his discussion, and the conclusions reached have the certainty which attaches to this order of investigation. One cannot help regretting that a like effort had not been made by the Christian Commission in the way of collecting religious and social statistics from the vast army that fought under the flag of the Union. Heretofore we have been dependent upon the decennial census for all that may relate to the commercial and agricultural statistics of our country, but prior to the last census no attention was paid to personal statistics. In that grand mustering of the people some little effort was made in this direction. It may be that, in 1870, the experience of the past as to our wants will give such intelligence in the plans for the taking of the census, that the investigations, undertaken by the Sanitary Commission

and perfected by Dr. Gould, shall be extended so as to comprise the whole of our population of both sexes, and of all ages. We are beginning now to know how to study such statistics; let us have them as full and complete as possible.

Of course it would be impossible to obtain the extensive data from all classes in civil life, which were readily and easily obtained from soldiers, but the more important peculiarities might be secured. And from these the prevailing peculiarities of the American people might in time be obtained, so that an approximation could be made to that typical idea which they embody. It would be but approximate until many years shall have passed away, in consequence of the immense tide of emigration, bearing with it strongly perturbating elements to the calculation, still each decennial period would furnish fewer and fewer of these perturbations, and results more and more accurate would be secured, as the homogeneity of the whole population was established.

Such anthropological statistics might include a large number of topics naturally belonging to the subject of hygiene. The effects of mental and physical occupation upon longevity would be entitled to a place in the investigation. Popular notion has it, that a long life is insured by employment in which muscle rather than brain is used, but recent research tends to the overthrow of this notion, since it shows that longevity is far from rare among brain workers. Popular notion has it, that travel bysteam is much more perilous to life than transportation by horse-power; statistics in France have shown during the period from 1835 to 1856, that there was 1 killed in 2,021,133, and 1 injured in 558,071 passengers on rail-roads, while there was 1 killed in 355,453, and one injured in 29,871 passengers in the Diligences,—from which the deduction is plain that danger is diminished by travel on rail. Still there are special classes of disease belonging to the nervous system, that have been increased by this mode of travel. These demand study, and the greatest aid can be secured by statistics. Popular notion has it, that the sewing machine is an unmitigated blessing, but statistics show that it has produced paralysis and various diseases

peculiar to the female sex from close and continuous application. Popular notion has it, that modern warfare is more fatal to life than was the case before the use of gunpowder, whereas statistics show an opposite result.

But sufficient has been said to show that mathematics may aid us largely in studying the problem of human health and the probable duration of human life, and in the attainment of the typal idea which shall best express the resultant of the apparently incongruous materials which are now acting upon each other in the production of the American people. Such investigations cannot lead to infidelity, but to truth, and it recognizes clearly the boundary that sharply divides the field of knowledge from the illimitable domain of faith.

ART. V.—PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATISM.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF.

THERE are two opposing elements in history, which often stand in direct antagonism to each other. This must always be the case when the equilibrium of normal forces is disturbed, and historical revolutions or tendencies become extreme or one-sided. But the presence of these antagonistic principles is the sure guaranty of growth and advancement. It has pleased the Almighty to govern the physical universe by centrifugal and centripetal forces, by laws of attraction and repulsion, and these counteracting tendencies are the great conservators of physical order. All the grandeur and glory of the starry empyrean above and around us, and the beneficent adjustment of the organic forces of our own globe, depend on the continual agency of this double, this contradictory arrangement. Has not the world of mental and moral agencies two poles, as well as the earth, and is not the antagonism between the positive and the negative, the objective and the subjective,

as necessary an element in the progress of history, as is the law in nature which, at the same time, propels the planets towards infinity of space, and binds them inexorably to the central sun?

There is a difference, of course, between the ethical and the physical, between the world of matter and of mind. Men are not the involuntary instruments of blind force; they are not tied down to orbits described by any law of absolute polar action. The world of matter stands by itself, is governed by its own laws, and is limited, by its own organic capacities, to its own proper sphere. It is capable of meeting the world of mind and combining with it, in such a way as to bring out the proper significance and to reach the true destiny of God's whole creation; but matter cannot produce mind, nor can the physical world beget and control the laws and powers of the moral. Nature has no creative, only reproductive capacity; the power that creates comes, not from below, but from above—it is the offspring, not of blind force, but of intelligence. Human progress is the result of similar laws—its agencies are free from the arbitrary limitations of the physical universe, and are lifted far above it in the order and royalty of being; yet the general stands above the individual, the free agency of man under the all-overruling Providence of God, in the course of human events; and therefore the laws and capacities of the lower world may be taken as images and exponents of the phenomena of the higher. The earth was formed, not by a mechanical, but by a dynamic process. It was not put together by arbitrary force, without reference to the innate affinity of its parts. Its various strata and kingdoms, although brought together by the creative power of the Divine will, are still the product also of the same organic law, and the existence of the lower looks continually towards the advent of the higher. The mineral, the vegetable, and the animal kingdoms, are but different members in one grand organism, the moral lordship of which is finally reached in man, who stands as the connecting link, as nature's great high priest, between earth and heaven. So in history there are conflicting ideas, opinions and doctrines,

a warring antagonism of mental and moral forces, apparently perhaps without order and unity of aim; but it is the antagonism of life and the freedom of law which, under the Headship of Him who is over all things to the Church, tend continually towards the consummation of a glorious final destiny.

Individuals think and act for themselves, communities and nations devote themselves to local and national interests, and races follow the bent of their distinctive idiosyncracies—all unconscious, it may be, of a tendency and a destiny common to them all. In the exercise of individual freedom, in the promotion of local and national interests, and in the conflict of nationalities and races, there is often such confusion, disorder and violence, that an indifferent looker-on will neither see the presence of the hand of God, nor the progressive agency of organic law. To such a mind history is nothing but an aggregation of events, brought together much like a heap of sand, or a drift of pebbles. This view is contradicted by the tenor of nature, even in its lower forms, and the historical progress of the human race is too palpable a fact now for any one seriously to entertain the notion, that it can be, in any sense, at the mercy of chance or caprice. There is a philosophy of history, and we can only come to a proper sense of its data and to a correct understanding of its revolutions, by comprehending the organic tenor of its life. If we come to it with the proper key, we will have no difficulty in making legitimate account of all its phenomena, and in doing full justice to all its demands.

History looks back; it is conservative; it holds on to the principles and institutions of the past. At no period of its progress can it break loose from the laws and conditions of its former life, and strike out upon an altogether original and independent course. All normal growth is conservative, and as the process of history is nothing else than the unfolding of powers and capacities that have been at hand, or involved, from the start, it is necessarily subject to the same law of development. But history looks forward also, just as the germ in the acorn looks toward the development of the tree, or in-

fancy reaches out after full manhood. It is progressive, and strives after a more complete realization of all its powers and principles, while it is bound, at the same time also, by the law of absolute necessity, to all that has been settled as normal and fundamental in the historic records of the ages.

It is extremely interesting to follow these two tendencies in history—the conservative and the progressive—and it is a work that may be engaged in with great profit to both heart and mind.

In the days of our Lord there were two leading sects among the Jews. These had been in existence for some time before His advent, and had fully developed their principles since the beginning of the reign of the Maccabees. The Pharisees were the popular party—they represented the interests of the people over against foreign dominion, and the introduction of foreign ideas, customs, and manners. They were the avowed defenders of the law, and came in conflict with the Sadducees, who were the infidels of their day, and felt little concern about the preservation of the specific peculiarities of the Mosaic economy. Christ came in conflict with both these parties, and His denunciations of the Pharisees seem to be even more severe than those of the Sadducees, which may appear somewhat strange, as the former were the zealous defenders of the divinely guaranteed rights of the Jewish people, while the latter denied some of the fundamental dogmas of Jewish faith, and fell in with the corrupting influences of Pagan philosophy and Pagan manners. Pharisaic conservatism itself must lead us to a proper sense of the reasons of the fearful maledictions of Jesus. These zealous defenders of the law were not inspired by its true genius, but they blindly worshiped the letter, and so degraded and perverted its meaning by their own traditions, as to be utterly blinded to the true spiritual character and mission of their own divine economy. They were, therefore, as much, if not more, at fault than their partisan opponents, and fell with them under the condemnation of being the enemies of the truth. Conservatism may be narrow, mechanical and blind; radicalism may be infidel, capricious, and destructive.

In that case neither of them can be trusted as the normal order of things. The true course of historic advancement lies in the channel of progressive conservatism, in that order of things which holds on to established facts and principles, while it makes liberal account also, however, of such improvements, reforms, and changes, as may be lawfully demanded by the progress of the times.

The absolute historical standard of all times is, the person and work of Jesus Christ. He is the center and life of all history, so that the ages before Him reach out after Him, and the ages after flow from Him. The process is essentially the same before and after the advent, as regards its conflicting or opposing tendencies, although it is very evident that it is more intense since the inauguration of the Christian era. From this time on it became world-historical in a special sense, and hence its deadly collision with the perverted life-forces of the world as this stood before. It was forced into a death-grapple in the first stages of its existence, with the colossal creations of Pagan superstition, by which it was assailed from without with all the weapons that bigotry and cruelty could devise; and from within by the most crafty perversion of the Christian mysteries. Persecution and heresy were joined together, in this way, in afflicting the Church and opposing the progress of the kingdom of God in the world. If we recount the events of the ten bloody persecutions which befell the early Church, heathen cruelty may make us pause with holy horror; but when we come to study the terrible battles of the orthodox faith, in that age, with the Gnostic heresies and isms of the times, we can scarcely help being inspired with wonder and awe. What a sad commentary do these early perversions of the Christian verity furnish us, on the reliability of human nature! But what a glorious fulfilment have we, in the triumph of the faith over all these errors, and of the promise that the gates of hades shall not prevail against the Church! These pains and perils of the early fathers, these bitter and bloody conflicts of the Patristic period, have produced some of the sweetest fruits of Christian piety, and raised up a species of heroism such as

the world had never seen. The dogmas then settled and the cultus then developed will remain the germinal, normative basis of the Christian faith to the end, and the odor of Patristic piety will not pass away while the world stands. It was there and then that the fountain of the Christian life was opened, the stream of whose refreshing waters will never cease to flow.

Never has any period of history been so entirely misunderstood and so blindly misrepresented, as the decade of centuries preceding the Reformation. Indeed partisan zeal went so far as to consign that age, with all its world historical issues, to the fantastic play of diabolical intrigue. A more careful study of medieval history is, however, causing better counsels to prevail. It is now known and acknowledged that the charge of total apostacy cannot be maintained, that the theological and ecclesiastical genius of those times was a consistent continuation of the life of the Patristic age, and in some respects even an improvement upon that, and that, instead of being recklessly apostate, tyrannical, and corrupt, tending continually towards popular degradation and ruin, it was the prolific womb of modern Christian civilization and of modern popular progress. It was emphatically an age of progressive conservatism, full of noble impulses and beneficent aims. Its struggles were terrific, and its conflicts violent and barbarous—a wild tumultuous ebbing and flowing of passion, cruelty, and caprice. But out of this chaos, order and beauty has been brought by the supremacy of medieval Catholicism. It was by its power and influence that headlong barbarian hordes were bridled, and raised up to the dignity of Christian nations. The gigantic efforts of the Church of the middle ages, in the sphere of missions, of beneficence, of social advancement, and of moral elevation, are simply grand and magnificent, not indeed in classic elegance and royalty of style, but in the hardy chivalry of a heroic Christian propagandism. Its monastic orders, its papal aggressions, its bloody persecutions, and the entire machinery of its offensive and defensive measures, all were the result of the evils of the times, and were doubtless

honestly intended to be reformatory and beneficial. However much mistaken this policy may have been in some respects, we may know by its fruits that it was not altogether a fallacy. As a schoolmaster, with an iron rod it is true, it has led to Christ and to the bliss of a highly civilized Christian state of society.

It is seen, therefore, that the charge of total apostacy flies directly in the face of history; that it is a shameless calumny, unsupported by facts, and hence abandoned and repudiated by the leading scholarship of the day. It is indeed a remarkable fact that partisan bigotry and prejudice could ever so far influence the historian, as to shut his eyes to the most unequivocal testimony of facts against his narrow and arbitrary conclusions. The maintenance of the maxims of the Christian faith, and Christian morality, over against lawless barbarian Paganism on the one hand, and against the fanatical and bloody onslaught of cruel, vindictive Islamism on the other, should alone have prevented so unfavorable a judgment, not to say anything of the palpable and vigorous pulsations of the Christian life, constantly at hand and always progressing throughout the entire period. Of course it is not to be taken for granted that history demands an entire surrender of the charge of wrong, of tyranny, of corruption, of apostacy. Had these bad elements not largely entered into its vast and solemn issues, and had the spirit of an enlightened faith and of a noble and generous Christian charity, always had sway of its lofty aims, the world-historical ecclesiastical rupture of the Sixteenth Century would have scarcely taken place. Had the conservatism of medieval Catholicism not in some way proved false to the enlightened convictions of the masses, just as the Jewish nation blindly rejected the advent of their Lord and Saviour, no mischief brewing against the Church, or concocted for the ruin of the papacy, could have succeeded in shaking the papal throne to its very base. No. It remained behind the progressive strides of modern history, and hence the triumph of the great schism. And had this triumph not been historical, in the sense of actual progress, growth, and advancement, it could not have carried

with it the main stream of modern history, and made steady progress from the start. Rome has not yet succeeded in regaining her supremacy, nor is it at all likely that she ever will, unless she can meet and fully satisfy all the legitimate popular wants of modern times. No mere arbitrary, mechanical, reactionary assertion of her authority will ever suffice.

History does not go backward. Great, grand, fundamental historical movements can never be set aside. The Protestant revolution, or Reform, has not only carried with it great numbers, and assumed immense popular proportions; it has been all along the embodiment of the best popular life-forces, and hence it has proven itself more than a successful rival to the papacy. It has had its difficulties and dangers, it has given birth to fearful abortions, it has at times been well nigh wrecked by its distractive tendencies, but all along it has been a historic world movement, that progressed steadily onward and upward, by the power of its own positive life, until finally its footprints are so deeply and indelibly engraven upon the popular consciousness that no one dare attempt to erase them. Such a movement cannot be overcome by any power, ancient or modern, in such a way as to set aside its historical significance, and turn back the Christian consciousness to what it was three hundred years ago.

Those who have witnessed the events of the last decade, should have no difficulty to come to a rational solution of this problem. We Americans at least ought to have some idea of the folly of ignoring the results of progressive historical birth-struggles, or of attempting to restore the worn-out, exploded dogmas and institutions of the past. Our American nationality had reached a crisis; one of two principles had to gain the mastery. War came, and the Republic was saved, but not in all respects as it stood before. It is the old Republic still, but in a higher phase of its development. If any one entertained the hope that the nation might be brought back to what it was before the war, it is now pretty generally understood and felt that such hope was blind. The issues of the war must and will be accepted, for the simple reason that these are vital to

the life and progress of the country, and the age. But if a revolution of so recent a date, and comparatively of so limited a character, could gather up into its history such radical, such progressive life-forces, and could make such an absolute and abiding epoch in the growth of the nation, and, perchance, in the history of the race, what then may we not expect from a movement which has not been confined to one people, or to one continent, but which has enlisted the best energies of the Christian world for centuries, and is to this day sustained by the convictions of the most enlightened Christian nationalities? If, in view of these facts, the Church of Rome can ever regain her former ascendency and take charge once more of the destiny of Christian civilization, she must display greater recuperative power and capacity of adaptation than she has thus far done.

But what must we make now of the success of Protestantism and the comparative failure of Roman Catholicism, in the relation in which they stand to each other in modern history? Must it be taken for granted that the superior progressive energy and success of the former is *prima facie* evidence that the Reformation carried with it a full and complete embodiment of the Christian faith, and that Romanism is therefore of no historical account or vital force in the progress of the race? Any such sweeping judgment, in reference to either of these systems, is not borne out by facts. If the one were such a full and palpable realization of the idea of Christian perfection, and the other a wholesale apostacy or a worn-out fossil, the conflict between them would have long since ended. Romanism would have gone down into ruin and utter destruction before the rising glory of the Evangelical movement. But nothing of the kind has taken place. These two antagonistic systems have stood face to face as powerful rivals, and they confront each other with unabated vigor at this day. No other forces in history have ever carried on such a war; the chasm which divides them is deep and wide, and yet there must be some sort of polar relation between them, else would they not be capable of such herculean antagonism in the life-process of modern

history. After a death-grapple, lasting more than three hundred years, Rome plants herself in the bosom of the most enlightened Protestant nationalities, and strikes boldly for conquest, and for mastery, and this with such marked success that, in some quarters, it causes no little anxiety and alarm. Is there not, then, a historical necessity for the existence of these rival powers, and will not their antagonism ultimately lead to such a mutual recognition of the necessity and significance of both, as will fit the Church for her last grand final victory over all the powers of darkness?

That the various Protestant bodies are becoming seriously conscious of defects and errors, is evident enough from the restless anxiety to escape from the evil consequences of the mistakes of former days, now showing itself in all directions. An earnest, deep, solemn protest is now coming up, from various quarters, against ecclesiastical disunion and schism, and a return to the confessional standards, creeds, and cultus of the past enters more or less into the aim and endeavors of all churches. All this seems to be more than a mere passing phenomenon, resting simply on the surface of the popular current. There is a consciousness of the necessity of the movement, and hence it has already been dealt with in a practical, matter-of-fact way. It has all the characteristics of a theological revolution, and it bids fair to bring about an actual advancement in the historic process of the kingdom of God in the world.

The union tendency is just now presenting itself, in its most marked character, in the movements of the two main divisions of the Presbyterian Church. They propose reuniting on the basis of their common confessional standards. This is a going back certainly, and a protest against the mad separatistic tendencies of former years. But will it amount to nothing more than a formal going back, and can it possibly result in a full restoration of the rigid Calvinistic confessionalism of days gone by? The reunion of these two schools will make a powerful organization, the influence of which will be felt far and wide. Yet, if there were no rival organizations of equal force

and strength, this united body itself will be far from coming down to such uniformity on the knotty symbolism of their standards, as will amount to a full and exact traditional restoration of the past. Such confessional conservatism would do violence to the genius of modern history, and would therefore be made to feel the penalty of its own narrowness.

In the Lutheran Church the movement is of a somewhat different order, yet it looks in the same general direction, at least as far as a return to the early standards is concerned. It is a going back here also, a measure of restoration, an honest battle for the confessional integrity of the Lutheran faith, over against the foreign life that has been so largely introduced into the theology and cultus of that denomination. As such, it is worthy of high regard and sincere sympathy; but if it stops here, and advances not to a higher and more Catholic position, it will not escape the charge of being unhistorical, and will reap the same pains and penalties of all one-sided reactionary movements. Evidently, however, that Church is not prepared for a mere return to the unaltered Augsburg Confession, taken in the sense of the later symbolical standards. An attempt to do this can meet with only limited success, and it will ultimately be borne down and swept away by the best and most conservative tendencies of the times; for the Lutheranism of the *Form of Concord* is too narrow for the broad issues of modern theology.

In the Anglican or Episcopal Church the same conflict is going on. Here, however, its retrogressive tendency is not particularly towards the confessional identity of the Reformation. It looks beyond this, and seems to ignore it, in its proper historical significances. It is an earnest, deep, solemn movement, worthy of careful study and regard. But when we bring it down to the test of historical consistency, we cannot but feel that it is placing itself in a false and dangerous position. Anglican Episcopacy can no more afford to ignore its Protestant position and history, than any of its sister churches, having all been begotten and carried forward by the same general historical revolution. Its conservatism is too narrow and too reactionary, to bear the test of time.

We find the same tendency at work in all churches, in a greater or less degree, and it would not be difficult to follow it and point out its characteristic phenomena. What we, however, wished to assert is now sufficiently clear—*neither the history of the Church as a whole, nor that of Protestant churches in particular, is absolutely fixed and finished at any point. It is bound to the past, and can never legitimately separate itself from its life and normative control; but it is free also, and progressive, and can never be bound by any other law but that of progressive conservatism.* This solution is forced upon us by history, and by the light of history must it either stand or fall.

And when we look all around now and see these facts as they present themselves from all quarters, and calmly, believingly, and prayerfully, reflect upon their meaning and significance, it is hardly possible that we can fail to see some reason and necessity for the existence and antagonism of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The presence of the former checks and corrects the bad tendencies of the latter, and the life, vigor, and progressive energy of the latter must modify and relax the stiff and rigorous conservatism of the former. Rome, practically, is not now what she was three centuries ago, neither can she ever be herself in the same sense again. Protestantism has also moved onward, and doubtlessly upward, and cannot go back historically to what it was in the beginning. Both must continue to move forward while they hold on to the foundations of the past, till they meet at last in some way, agreeing with the law of history and the will of the Master, in the higher glories of the Evangelical Catholic Church of the future.

This is what may be understood by progressive conservatism.

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

ART. VI.—ONCE FOR ALL.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D.

Heb. x. 10. *By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.*

FIRST PART.

THE whole Gospel centres in the death of Christ. Here, in a profound sense, we have the ground of redemption; because here only we have the atonement—the sacrifice which takes away sin, and through this the victory, at the same time, which makes room for life and immortality. He was put to death for our offences, and raised again for our justification (Rom. iv. 25). By dying He destroyed death, and him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; so as to deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage (Heb. ii. 14, 15).

In the passage before us (which is but the key note to a large part of the argument of the Epistle to which it belongs), the offering which Christ thus made of Himself for our sins is declared to have been *once for all.* In this character it may be considered under a threefold view.

I. RETROSPECTIVELY, or as related to the time going before it, the death of Christ was "once for all," because it concluded and brought to an end the meaning and force of all older religious services looking in the same direction. It fulfilled the sense of these services, and thus made them to be no longer of any such effect as before, by now in the end of the ages actualizing in itself once and forever what they had been vainly striving to reach by their continuous repetition through all previous time.

It did this, in some measure, even for the false religions of Paganism. For false religions are never so false as to have in them no sort of truth whatever. They have their ground al-

ways in the original religious nature which is common alike to all men, and which can never be insensible altogether to its own deepest religious needs; however incompetent it may be, in our present fallen state, to say what the want involves or how it is to be met with proper redemption and help. Every false religion is in this way a dark dream of the hungering spirit, symbolizing through the fancy unreal forms of good answerable to its sense of vacuity and need—the projection of what is in the human subject only over into imaginary objective shapes, which are then embraced as the presence of the divine itself. This of course is a grand lie, a device of Satan for the delusion of the nations; but it has in it still a relation to the truth, though it be mainly as caricature only and perversion. And in virtue of this relation it is now (as it was well understood by the early Christian fathers), that there is room to speak even of the old Pagan religions as being in their way a preparation for the Gospel. True, the preparation was negative only, and not positive; but still in this view it carried in it a deep meaning, the burden of a magnificent though awful prophecy, we may say, which reached its fulfilment at last only when Shiloh came (the Desire of all nations, Hag. ii. 7) to whom the "gathering of the people" has since been (Gen. xlix. 10). The sense of all the old heathen worship thus found its proper end in the death of Christ. Its temples, altars, sacrifices, priesthoods—whatever of negative dreamy instinct they may have had in them before—became here at once the baseless fabric of a vision, through the effulgence of the Sun of Righteousness rising on the world in its full power and glory.

But if the death of Christ fulfilled in this way the sense of Paganism, it carried with it still larger significance under the same view as the end and fulfilment of Judaism. Here religion was more than the voice of nature, and more than the projection of the mere human self. It was both positive and objective—based on actual revelations of truth from the eternal world, which were at the same time so many acts or deeds on the part of Jehovah, whereby He entered more and more really always into the historical movement of the world's life. In

such view, the institutions and services of the Old Testament had in them a certain measure both of truth and power, answerable to the truth and power of what religion is in the New Testament, and also of one order with this as far as it went. These Old Testament forms were not empty and hollow forms by any means. They had for their time a positive force, in the way of helping men and pleasing God. But still, as we know, they were only "the shadow of good things to come and not the very image of the things" themselves.

The Jewish religion was throughout a shadow or picture simply of the Christian religion. Such is the view taken of it everywhere in the New Testament; and the Epistle to the Hebrews, in particular, is full of it from beginning to end. Looking at the matter in this way, the truth and power of the Old Testament religion must be considered as being everywhere partial and relative only, and dependent on what was to follow by the coming of Christ; just as the dawn which precedes the rising of the sun is in fact dependent on the still unrisen sun itself; so that if Christ had not come, all would have been convicted of having been dream or phantasm only, and nothing more, from the beginning.

In the advent of the Saviour, all previous revelations reach their last full sense. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son" (Heb. i. 1, 2). That is the end of all His manifestations of Himself going before. And so all the Old Testament institutions, ministries and services end in Christ; not as if their relative significance had been of no account in its own time, but because "when that which is perfect is come then that which is in part must be done away."

The temple, with all its worship, fell away, and became of no worth, when the Lord of the temple stood Himself revealed in human form as the Word made flesh, the true full tabernacle of God among men, "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person."

The mediatorial offices and functions of the Levitical priest-

hood ceased in Him, who is a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec ("having neither beginning of days nor end of life"), the one only real Mediator between God and men.

And so it was with the sacrifices which the priests offered daily ministering in the temple. They were "offered year by year continually," just because they could not of themselves "make the comers thereunto perfect;" and because their ultimate sense and force lay always beyond themselves, in the great sacrifice which was to be offered up afterwards on Calvary. This offering of the body of Jesus Christ on the cross was once for all. It took up into itself the long progression of sacrifices going before, and ended it by making it at once and forever complete. The substance took the place of its shadows. The types came to a full pause, in their glorious antitype.

II. CIRCUMSPECTIVELY, or as related to all around and outside of itself at any given time, the death of Christ is "once for all," because it is an absolute and all sufficient sacrifice for the sins of men; which as such, can never need to be accompanied or followed by any other sacrifice or service having for its object the same end.

In this sense, the one offering of Christ excludes or shuts out the thought of any atonement for sin, any ground of righteousness and peace with God, other than that which is here presented to our faith. It needs no completion from beyond itself, no addition or supplement to itself: and it can bear no rivalry of its claims, no co-ordination of merit or worth, under any other form. It is the only and whole ground of our justification before God.

So if this sacrifice be rejected through the disobedience of unbelief, there is no room to conceive of any other coming in to supply its place. "If we sin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth," we are told Heb. x. 26, "*no more sacrifice for sins*," but only the doom of certain perdition.

Not only are all sacrifices of other nature and kind shut out by the exclusiveness of this one offering for sin; it shuts out also the thought of all subsequent repetition of itself; since any

repetition of this sort must proceed on the assumption that the original offering was not absolutely complete, and so in a real and true sense once for all—in which view it would be a new sacrifice standing outside of the first, and dividing with it, at least, the credit of our salvation. The Old Testament sacrifices were "offered year by year continually" in this way; just because they had no power to make an end of sin. But in contrast with this precisely it is that it is said of Christ: "This man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever (one ever-during sacrifice), sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool"—the work of atonement being now complete, and needing no repetition to the end of time. "For by one offering He hath perfected FOREVER them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 12–14). "Now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself"(Heb. ix. 26).

It is one charge against the Church of Rome, we know, that she teaches the need of such a repetition of the original sacrifice of Christ, and supposes it to take place perpetually in what is called the sacrifice of the mass. The Roman Church herself, of course, protests against this as a false construction of her sacramental doctrine; it must be confessed, however, that the doctrine has been so stated at times as to make it seem of this monstrous sense; and in this sense also, there would appear to be no doubt, it has been widely accepted by multitudes at least of the common people in her communion. So far as this now may actually be the case, there ought to be no hesitation in pronouncing it an unchristian error. And looking at the error simply in such naked expression, we are bound to say of it with the memorable 80th question of the Heidelberg Catechism, that it is at bottom "nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Jesus Christ." Just as there can be but one Christ, and any supposed new incarnation of the eternal Word would reduce to nothing the significance of the first incarnation; so any supposed new propitiatory offering of Himself for our sins, on the part of the Saviour, must reduce to nothing in like manner the significance of the one offering He

has already accomplished for us by His death on the cross. That was, and is, and ever shall be, *Once for All.*

III. And thus we come to consider, in the third place, what this character of "once for all," here applied to the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, must be taken to mean PROSPECTIVELY, or as related to the time following it on to the end of the world.

Negatively, as we have just seen, it shuts out the idea of any other subsequent sacrifice: because by its own fullness, once accomplished, there could be no room ever after for any such service outside of itself. But this implies at once, as we may easily see, a continuously present relation on its own part to all following time; for only so could the fullness of the sacrifice be such as to leave no void, age after age, for the coming in of any other sacrifice. Positively then, and not alone negatively, in its relation to the future, the sacrifice which Christ made by Himself on the cross was once for all, because it was of perennial, ever-during force, and in such view had no end. Once made, it was made forever. The presence of it, and the power of it, run with unbroken force through the ages.

No one can study attentively the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews without seeing that this is the main thought here in the writer's mind. The death of Christ ends the Old Testament sacrifices, and shuts out all other possible sacrifices, just for this reason, that it is, in its own order, of undying, inexhaustible force, and therefore not capable of being superseded by any other offering of similar form. This is the nerve of the entire argument; without which, indeed, it must be regarded as carrying with it no demonstrative power whatever.

And yet strange to say, there are those who, in regard to this point, perversely force on the Epistle to the Hebrews the very opposite of the sense which its argument here so plainly requires. They will have it, that "once for all" means, not "once and always," but simply "once and no more." The *once*, with them, is not an unending once—a once, that reaches perennially through the ages; but a poor finite, transitory once; a mere event in past history, that has come and gone; that was of old, and now is not; a once, which is done and left

behind, and with which the world has to do now only in the way of memory or thought.* All this to magnify, as they pretend, the oneness of Christ's sacrifice, by making it solitary and alone over against the notion of its being perpetuated in any way according to the supposed doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. But such isolation, alas, turns the atonement in fact into an abstraction, and robs it in the end of all its proper living power.

The conception, indeed, rests in a false abstraction from the start. It sunders the sacrifice of Christ from His life, and holds it to be something which having been once made is no longer dependent on His presence for its force; being in this respect like a price paid, or an act done, by one man in behalf of others, which afterward holds no farther connection with his person, but is valid and efficacious of itself for all following time, even though the man himself should die, or while living should change his mind with regard to it altogether. Such a view of the atonement, we know, has not been uncommon. But it is a great and sore error. As such an abstraction, the atonement could not be of perennial, never dying force, in the sense in which it is declared to be so in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Such force it has, we are here expressly taught, only

* A strange way of magnifying the *Son of Man* certainly, which insists on making His human life so solitary, that it shall have no inward continuously historical relationship to the real life of humanity whatever, but shall float over it simply as an outward abstraction, touching it only here and there in a mechanical and magical way. How can the mediation of Christ stand us in stead as dying sinners, if its atoning, quickening, justifying and sanctifying powers be not of abiding force for us in the bosom of the living mediation itself, by which He stands continually between us and God? Those who cannot think of any such continued extension of the Mediatorial power and working of Christ (under a concrete and not simply abstract character in the Church), without running it at once into the notion of a crass materialistic pantheism, only show the shallowness and weakness of their own thinking, and have no right to burden their wretched monstrosity on what is here the clear truth of the Gospel itself. If even in the natural world the Divine Logos may work, and we are bound to believe *does* work (for by Him all things *consist*, Col. i. 17), with continually efficient power, and yet with no pantheistic confusion, in and through the powers of nature; why should it be counted at all paradoxical to conceive or speak of a like extension of His Mediatorial activities in the world of grace? It is not this but the opposite view, which is indeed hard for faith, however easy i may seem to be for mere notional fancy.

because it is no abstraction; is not in any sense torn and sundered from the life of Christ Himself; but stands perpetually in the presence and power of this life, and *therefore* is indestructible as the life itself. The sacrifice of Christ is once for all—never loses its force, never comes to an end—just because Christ Himself is once for all, and cannot come to an end or die. The atonement holds in the death of Christ, but only in this as swallowed up by the power of His victorious resurrection. It has no existence on the outside of His life, or as an event lying behind it in its present glorified form. It is part of His Mediatorial being as this now stands. It inheres perennially, or forever, in what He has become for us men, and for our salvation, through His descending first into the lower parts of the earth, and then ascending up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things (Eph. iv. 9, 10).

This precisely is the thought that underlies everywhere the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ is greater than all men or angels, the only true Mediator between God and men. His priesthood is without succession, after the similitude of Melchisedec; being constituted, we are told (Heb. vii. 16), not after the law of a carnal commandment (temporary, shadowy weak), but after the *power of an endless life*. This endless life it is, that imparts endless significance to His death as well as to all His work. His blood cleanseth from all sin, and has power sacrificially to "purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God," just because, in distinction from the blood of bulls and goats, it was poured forth through the eternal Spirit, or never-dying Divine life, which was in Him, and by which He offered Himself without spot to God (Heb. ix. 14). The eternal principle of the Redeemer's sacrifice makes it to be of undying efficacy and worth; in virtue of which "He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He *ever liveth* to make intercession for them"—the power of the sacrifice holding on continually in the power of His risen and glorified life, and imparting to it its all-prevailing intercessory force (Heb. vii. 25).

And here it is now that our subject is found widening itself

suddenly into a still broader range of thought. As it is with the sacrifice of Christ in its relation to His life, so is it also with every part of His Mediatorial character and work. The whole Christian salvation rests continually in the power of His life. His offices and functions, His teachings and doings, are at large what they are, only through the fact of their appertaining to His blessed person; and in this view, then, they share also in the immortal being of His person, and are thus (like the offering of His body on the cross) once for all—or in other words, of never-ending, undying force.

"The words that I speak unto you" we hear Him saying—"they are spirit and they are life;" and to this we have the response of faith on the part of His disciples: "Thou hast words of eternal life"—words that breathe forth from this life, and breathe it into others—"and we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." The words of Christ are not abstractions; they stream out through all time from the fountain of life in His person; they ray themselves forth continually from Him as the unquenchable Sun of righteousness; and therefore they are quick and powerful, and are said to "endure forever."

And just in the same way are we to conceive of the works of Christ (His words themselves indeed are works); of what He has done for our salvation; of the mighty mediatorial acts, through which He has made room for our deliverance from death and our restoration to holiness and eternal life. These, too, are in no sense abstractions—things to be torn from His person, as if being once accomplished they could have their value afterward, without Him, in themselves. On the contrary, they inhere and abide forever in His glorified existence, and so work on through the ages; in this sense, "once for all;" once, as absolute; once, as final and conclusive; once, as needing no repetition; yet not once, as over and gone—but once, as coming to no end; because resident forever in the "power of an endless or indissoluble

life" (Heb. vii. 16); even the life of Him, "that liveth and was dead, and is now alive for evermore."*

SECOND PART.

It is under the view of the Gospel now given, especially, that we are enabled to make a proper comparison between two great reigning schemes or theories of Christianity, which are found continually dividing the sense of the Christian world between them, while yet it is not easy always to see, at particular points, wherein exactly their difference consists. The divergency starts in the sense they attach respectively to the word *once for all*, as it applies to the objective side of our salvation.

In one scheme, the facts which underlie the Christian redemption, the words and deeds by which Christ has made salvation possible for us, are eyed habitually as belonging in their own proper existence to the past rather than to the

* It seems a strange thing, certainly, that any should question at all the fundamental significance of Christ's life, in this view. Yet there are those who do so; and who even go so far as to make it a point of orthodoxy, that the ground power of the Gospel shall be taken to hold in something taught or done by the Saviour, rather than in the very person of the Saviour Himself. The Unitarian dreams of a doctrine of life and immortality revealed by Christ in this way, as something out of Himself and more than Himself. But this is not the Gospel. The word of a common man may be true, and his act may have force, apart from his own poor being. Not so with Christ. In Him, truth and being, action and life, are one. The law was given by Moses; externally, mediately, instrumentally; he did not make it, and it stood not at all in his person. But grace and truth, we are told, came by Jesus Christ, shining forth from His Mediatorial being itself "as the glory of the only begotten of the Father." He was Himself at the first, and is still, the "life and immortality" which He has brought to light. Here Unitarianism breaks down at once and forever. But here also must break down any scheme of Christianity, which turns any part of Christ's mediatory work into the character of a fact no longer dependent on His person. The atonement itself, wrought out by the death of Christ, draws all its force from His Mediatorial life, and is of enduring efficacy only in and through this life; being, in such view, κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου. The Mediatorial life of Christ is the overflowing fountain of all His grace toward the world in other forms. This is the great thought in which Calvin so much abounds, especially when discoursing of the Lord's Supper; namely, Christ Himself made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption (1 Cor. i. 30); the human life or flesh of the Mediator a reservoir of ever living grace, forth from which only are derived to men all the benefits of the Christian salvation to the end of time.

present. They have been once (faith consists in believing *that*), but they are not now; only the knowledge and memory of them remains, as of other simply historical events. In this way, they become abstractions. They are sundered from the present life of Christ; and are taken to have their worth once for all in themselves, and as lying behind what He has now become altogether. They work upon us thus, it is supposed, only as doctrines apprehended through our thinking. To conceive of them as in any way living still—as being in any sense still just what they were at the first, "quick and powerful" (Heb. iv. 12), "spirit and life"—is felt to be mystical, if not absolutely superstitious. It is easy to see how, for this sort of thinking, the "powers of the world to come" (which in Heb. vi. 5 are plainly forces resident in the Christian economy itself this side the grave) must in the end lose their objective significance entirely, and resolve themselves into the notion of mere subjective workings of the human spirit, wrought upon by the Spirit of God. We are all more or less familiar with Christianity in this form. It has no faith in the Church as a Christian mystery, and shrinks from the acknowledgment of any saving virtue in God's Sacraments. It is of course constitutionally unliturgical; as it can see no meaning either in the Church Year. It is not able to say the Creed without mental reservation. Yet it claims to be spiritual, beyond others; and studiously affects an exclusive right to the title *Evangelical!*

The other scheme is that way of looking at the Gospel which we have now under consideration; where the accomplished facts of redemption are felt to be at hand still in the abiding life of Him through whom they have been accomplished, and the perennial mystery of the incarnation (the real coming of Christ in the flesh) is seen to impart a like perennial character (the *once* an undying *now*) to all the mysteries which are brought to pass by it, and so are comprehended in it forever. The universal mediation of the Gospel stands once and always in the person of the One Mediator between God and man, our Lord Jesus Christ, who is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." There can be no mediatorial function or work out-

side of His mediatorial life. His acts of redemption are forever established in Himself, the Incarnate Word; and holding there, they are not, and cannot possibly be, thoughts or memories merely, things past and gone; they are not dead acts, but acts that live always, and carry with them life-giving power; just because they have their seat perpetually in that "Eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us," by the coming of Christ into the world.*

The mediation of Christ did not come to an end with His earthly life. It still goes forward, and in doing so involves in itself still the value and force of all that was accomplished by His death. All must admit this, who call themselves Christians; even those who see in the historical Gospel mainly the memory only of past facts, cut off from the present life of the Saviour Himself. He ever liveth, they say, to make intercession for us, in the presence of God, on the basis of His past earthly work. But here again their way of sundering act and life in the Mediatorial mystery is found to land us in new ab-

---

* The difference of these two schemes forms at bottom the real issue, between what is called our Mercersburg theology (rightly understanding itself) and the various foes that "compass it about like bees." Other questions belonging to the general controversy are only of secondary account. This is the main question, the root of all the rest. The controversy among Episcopalians between high church and low church, as generally maintained, is not just the same thing. That is ecclesiastical, rather than theological; and the ecclesiasticism, through want of a true church theology, becomes too often offensively pedantic. It is quite common for those who affect to be high churchmen in this poor way, to be quite as lean in their divinity as the low churchmen they do battle with on the opposite side. But what can any question of bishops, liturgies, or sacraments be worth, apart from the question of the perennial powers of Christianity, as comprehended once for all in the living person of the Redeemer? It is humiliating, that it should be so hard to engage serious attention to what is here plainly of such fundamental account for all right Christian doctrine and life. The only controversialists who have pretended at all thus far to meet our theology at this radical point, have been the respected German brethren, Dr. Ruetenik, of Cleveland, and Professor Dorner, of Berlin. Our other censors and critics, as a general thing, have not been able yet, with regard to it, to get beyond the merest balderdash and bosh. Only think of the Princeton Review, of which one might have expected better things, thrown open lately (by such responsible editors as *Charles Hodge, D. D.*, and *Lyman H. Atwater, D. D.*), to the unintelligible nonsense of the Rev. A. S. Vaughan!

straction—the last error, we may say, being still worse if possible than the first. For now the resurrection state of the Saviour is sublimated into a state above and beyond the world altogether; and this again is so attenuated for the view of faith as to be hardly itself distinguishable at last from a Gnostic phantom. The atonement made on Calvary eighteen centuries ago, and the intercession now going forward on the strength of it, far above all heavens, in this abstract way, are alike doctrines only for this scheme, rather than actual historical life-facts, and are in danger always of losing their objective reality in the swimming mists of a mere subjective idealism.

It is not thus that the continued working of the glorified Son of Man for the redemption of the world, is set before us in the New Testament. Here His whole past mediation is represented as taken up into the power of His whole present mediation (all being in truth but one and the same Eternal Life), and as going along with it continually to the end of time; while this entire mediation, at the same time, is not exercised simply in the heavens, but reaches down into the living history of men here on earth, as really and truly as any other powers that have to do with the world's life. It is a mediation, not for God only but also for man; and which therefore, while it touches God, must touch man likewise in his present earthly and mortal state. How else should it be for him any true mediatorial salvation at all?

In dying, and rising again from the dead, Christ passed into a new order of existence (no longer "in the flesh," St. Peter tells us, 1 Pet. iii. 18, but "in the spirit"); which, however, amounted in no sense to a sundering of Himself, from the life of the human world as He had made Himself one with it in becoming man. His resurrection served only to bring Him more intimately and deeply into the heart of this life, and to make Him in this way the principle of redemption for it more powerfully and efficaciously than before. "I will not leave you orphans," we hear Him saying; "I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more; but ye see

Me: because I live, ye shall live also"(John xiv. 18, 19). "Because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you" (John xvi. 6, 7). This is plain. The going away of Christ was to be His coming back again in the full power of the Holy Ghost; who in such new form could not come till after His death and glorification (John vii. 39); and in and by whose presence then He was to be Himself afterwards more efficaciously among men than before, in the exercise of all His Mediatorial functions and powers. So with St. Paul everywhere, the lifting up of Christ far above all heavens, is only the full letting down of Christ again into the bosom of the world, for the purposes of its new creation (Eph. iv. 8–13). The achievements of redemption wrought out by Him previously—in His life of temptation and sorrow, in His atoning death and passion, in His descent to hades, in His resurrection, in His glorious ascension—were not left behind in this exaltation; they went along with it, and belong to it still; and are thus once for all in what He has become through it, namely, Head over all things to the Church—"from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

The Mediatorial working of Christ in the world, then, is something more than the memory simply of what He has done in it centuries ago (in the Wilderness—on Tabor—on Calvary —on Olivet); something more than the doctrine merely of what He is supposed to have been doing in the heavenly world all centuries since, as our intercessor and advocate at the right hand of God. It is indeed, in an important sense, a celestial, more than simply terrestrial agency; it holds in the heavens, in an order of being above and beyond nature; but it is not that only; it joins itself also with the actual life of men here on earth, and takes hold of it in the most real and constant way.

It is working always in the world itself, on to the end of time.

And where is it now, we may ask, that Christ thus works continuously among men, causing them to "taste the good word of God and the powers of the world to come," in His character of Mediator and Redeemer?

To this the general answer is, of course, sufficiently plain. Christ works thus in the Spirit. His Mediatorial presence among men is mediated by the power of the Holy Ghost.

But where, we may ask again, have we the presence of the Holy Ghost, as thus mediating for the world the Mediatorial presence and working of the glorified Christ?

Not certainly in the constitution of nature as such; nor yet in the general life of man in its simply natural view. The Spirit of God does indeed breathe in the powers of nature; and enters also, with a still higher inspiration, into all that is good or great, in the moral world—the general world of human intelligence and thought. For "there is a spirit in man," we are told, "and the inspiration (or inbreathing) of the Almighty giveth them understanding." But all this belongs still only to the order of nature, and falls short immeasurably of what the presence of the Holy Ghost in the world has come to be through the Gospel, as the fruit of our Saviour's glorification at the right hand of God. Here we have the same Holy Ghost as before; but the mode of His existence and working in the world is altogether new. It belongs not to the old creation, to what may be called the simply natural relationship of God to the world; but is the result of the new supernatural order of grace in Christ, through which room has been made for a far more intimate union of God with man than before. It is only the Holy Ghost under this new mode of existence, then, that can be said to constitute the sphere of Christ's Mediatorial activity in the world. This is the Promise of the Father; the fontal Gift of Pentecost, from which stream forth all other gifts and graces of the Gospel; the home, where the powers of the world to come dwell and make themselves felt objectively through all time; the Holy Ghost of the Apostles' Creed.

The Spirit of God, thus, in and by which our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, now works in the world, is not the Divine Spirit at large in its relations to the human spirit; and these general relations are not the home and medium of His glorified presence among men.

To say differently, would be to break down the distinction between nature and grace, and to resolve the conception of what the New Testament calls the "powers of the world to come," into a sublimation simply of the powers of the present world. The order of nature is not, and cannot be, as such, the order of grace; not because the Holy Ghost is wanting altogether in the order of nature; for He is there always, in fact, working powerfully in a mode of presence answerable to its constitution; but because the order of grace is the result of a new and higher mode of His presence, made possible only through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

This order of grace thus necessarily distinct from the order of nature and transcending it, though holding always in the bosom of it—the home at once of the Spirit, proceeding from the glorified Mediator, and of the glorified Mediator Himself —must have, no less necessarily, an objective constitution of its own, just as really as the order of nature with which it is supernaturally joined.

In such view it becomes a necessary *object* of Christian faith, and forms for it in fact the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church; while it determines, at the same time, the necessary place and sequence of this article, standing just where it does in the Christian Creed.*

* Why is the Church in the Creed at all, if it be not an objective mystery like the other articles of this glorious old symbol? Those who turn it into anything less, as all unchurchly and rationalistic religionists do, may be sure that they are not in right agreement here, or elsewhere, with the original Christian faith. The mystery of the Church is *postulated* for this faith always, by what goes before in the grand movement of redemption; in which view then also, the faith itself looks not directly and first of all to any given or actually existing form of the Church historically considered, but to the general necessity of it rather as flowing from the gift of the Holy Ghost. Not so, however, as by any means to stop with such mere idea of the Church, making out of it only an invisible abstraction. Faith eyes first the ideal necessity of the Church; but only through this to reach out, then, toward the ap-

The Church then, apprehended in this way, is the peculiar sphere of Christ's continuous Mediatorial presence and working in the world to the end of time. Hence it is called His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. He works indeed only in and by the Holy Ghost; but the Holy Ghost is no abstraction; the Holy Ghost is a mode of actual Divine existence among men, following supernaturally the glorification of the Saviour, and having for itself objectively its own supernatural home in the general flow of the world's life; and this home is the Church. The Mediatorial working of Christ is not in the order of nature, but in the order of grace. He is Head over *all* things to the Church it is true, and bends the powers of nature, both physical and spiritual, to the purposes of His higher kingdom; but the power by which He does this is more than natural, and more than simply humanitarian. It is theanthropic; and holds exclusively in the relation, which Christ bears always, through His Spirit, to the Holy Catholic Church.

And here it is, accordingly, that room is made for the full verification of the great word ONCE FOR ALL, as it applies of right not only to the original offering of our Saviour's body for sin—the central fact of the Christian redemption—but to all the offices and functions also of His Mediatorial Life. All these endure, and work enduringly (like the powers of nature in *their* order and way, Ps. cxix. 89–91), not only in heaven, but also on the earth, and among men, in that glorious constitution of grace which we call the Church, and which the universal Christian world has acknowledged with one mouth through all ages, as being one of the grand cardinal mysteries of the Creed.

---

prehension of its actual existence in the world. Let no one say that this is visionary mysticism. My belief that "God is in history," does not depend on my being able to see and show that history is everywhere full of His presence; there is very much in it that looks empirically all the other way. On the contrary, my belief in the general truth goes first (a postulate of religion); to such extent that without it, I can never either seek or find the verification of it in any actual history whatever. And just so it is with our faith in the Church. No one ever found the Church as an object of faith outwardly, no one ever seriously sought to find it in this way, for whom it was not in the first place an object of faith inwardly—an *a priori* postulated necessity of the Christian Creed itself.

Here the Christian sacrifice never ceases. Alas for us, if it did! The one "pure offering" of Calvary (Mal. i. 11) reaches through the ages; not as a theorem or doctrine simply—much less as a brazen-serpent type or symbol only—but as the very presence itself of an endlessly efficacious atoning *power*, which is able through faith to "purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (Heb. ix. 14).

The Christian sacrifice—in this way not new, but undying and perennial—involves necessarily the idea also of a perennial Christian altar. So it is argued in the Epistle to the Hebrews xiii. 10; where of course no material altar is meant, like that belonging to the Jewish temple; while yet it is plain from the whole tenor of the Epistle that Christianity is regarded as possessing here, as well as elsewhere, the abiding essence and substance of what belonged to Judaism in shadow only and transitory outward form.

So the mediation of Christ at large, based on His sacrifice, is a perpetual living mediation in and through the Church (that is, in and through the Holy Ghost, whose Christ-wrought presence in the world forms now the presence and very being of the Church); this holding to Christ in truth, according to St. Paul, the relation of body to head, and being in a wonderful mystery thus, the organ and medium of His whole Mediatorial action among men (Eph. i. 18–23; iv. 16).

"He hath washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father" (Rev. i. 6). This does not mean that we are made typical kings and priests simply—of one sort with the adumbrations generally of the Old Testament; nor yet that we are made metaphorical kings and priests only, figuring with mere outward resemblance the kingly and priestly dignity of Christ. It means unquestionably that we are made kings and priests, in virtue of our mystical union with Christ Himself; whereby because He lives, *we* also live (His life drawing our life on after it, away out to the resurrection of the last day); and whereby, then, the Mediatorial fullness of His life, in His prophetical, priestly, and kingly offices, is not confined to Himself, but is

made to pass over to His people; so that they also, in their measure and proportion, repeat and carry forward, as it were, the power of these several offices in their own lives.* "In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," according to the Apostle; and we are "complete in Him"—our fullness is derived and led forth evermore from His fullness (Philip. ii. 9, 10).

And as it is here with individual believers, according to their measure of capacity and power, so is it also still more with the life of the Church collectively taken. The ministries and services of the Church, flowing from Christ, partake in their degree of the prophetical, priestly and kingly character of Christ Himself. He works in them, and through them, by the power of the Holy Ghost (perennially, one age after another), for the ends of His kingdom.†

---

* This is beautifully set forth in the 32d Question of The Heidelberg Catechism; where, after notice taken in the previous Question of the prophetical, priestly, and kingly offices comprehended in the title *Christ* or *Anointed* as applied to our blessed Redeemer, it is asked further: "But why art thou called a Christian?" To this then the answer follows: "Because by faith I am a member of Christ, and thus a partaker of His anointing"—His life in this way conveying over into mine a portion of its own Mediatorial quality and power; "in order that I also may confess His name"—as a *prophet;* "may present myself a living sacrifice of thankfulness to Him"—as a *priest;* "and may with free conscience fight against sin and the devil in this life, and hereafter, in eternity, reign with Him over all creatures"—as a *king*. This is bold language on the part of the Catechism; but who will say that it goes beyond the sense of either St. John, St. Peter, or St. Paul?

† "The Christian ministry no priesthood" is a favorite point for ringing charges upon, with those who think to dignify the one only Mediatorship of Christ, by allowing it no egress from His own person, no outworking force in the actual life of His body, the Church. Two tracts have fallen in my way lately, from the opposite camps of Episcopacy—high church and low church—both harmoniously (though inconsistently) concurrent on this theme. Now it is true that the title *priest* in the Anglican ministry is only an accident, a corruption of the word *presbyter;* and there is a bad affectation in the way it is now mouthed by the Romanizing ritualists. Neither is it fitting in itself, to distinguish Christian ministers by the standing title of priests, any more than it would be to distinguish them by the standing title of prophets or kings. But it is another matter altogether to deny the existence of a priestly quality of any sort, in the powers and offices of the Christian ministry. Those who do so, are themselves generally willing to allow it something of a kingly and prophetical character. But why should it be supposed to derogate from the *Oneness* of Christ's Mediatorship, to allow a ministerial constitution of its priestly force in the Church, any more than to allow a continuation in this way of its pro-

And what a flood of light, finally, all this throws on the doctrine of the Christian sacraments. Where the powers of redemption are regarded simply as facts thought of in a far off past, or in a far off heaven, the sacraments representing them can never be in relation to them more than mere outward signs, as they are taken to be in all unchurchly Christianity. The old definition may indeed still be retained, *The visible sign of an invisible grace;* but this will be eviscerated sacrilegiously of its true sense, and made to mean just its own opposite—a visible sign, namely, having in it no grace whatever: on the contrary, looking clear away from itself always to grace somewhere else, a past experience, perhaps, or it may be only the general mercy of the Gospel. But how all is at once changed, when the whole "grace of God which bringeth salvation" is apprehended as a supernatural presence objectively at hand once for all, through the continuous mediation of Christ in the Church! Then room is made for seeing how the outward side of the sacrament, by Divine constitution (not human fancy), may indeed enshrine the inward side as an actual object—*exhibiting* thus the invisible in the visible; so that it shall be possible for faith—not bodily sense nor natural understanding—to lay hold of the first as a grace really present in the last. So apprehended, a sacrament is of course always a mystery; which it never is at all in the other view. It is the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever, made to look out upon us for the moment through the transient covering of sense.

Universally, we may say, the Christian Creed has to do with ever-living realities, which have their enduring supernatural existence in the undying Mediatorial life of our Lord and

---

phetical force (teaching), or of its kingly force (church government and discipline); all, of course, effectual at last for the purposes of His kingdom only through His own Spirit? How else indeed, we may well ask, can any earnest be made with that "universal priesthood of believers," which all unchurchly religionists find it so easy to roll as a sweet morsel under their tongues? If this is to be anything more than a single humanitarian distinction (of one sort with the slang of Masonic brotherhoods, liberalists, friends of light, *et id genus omni*), it must come in some way by derivation from the general life of Christ in the Church. But how can this be, if there be not the presence of a priestly character, first of all, in the life of the Church itself under such general view, and so then also in all its heaven-ordained ministries and powers?

Saviour Jesus Christ. The things that we believe in the Creed are not dead things—not memories, doctrines, or abstractions; but the powers of a higher world, near to us and surrounding us at all times, through the glorified presence of the Son of Man working by His Spirit in the Church.

Working by His Spirit, we say, in the Church—not otherwise and elsewhere. This, let it be well considered in conclusion, involves a double circumscription and bounding; a bounding of the sphere of Christ's activity in one view, and then a bounding of the sphere of the Spirit's activity in another view. The two mutually determine each other. Christ works where the Spirit makes room for His working, and the Spirit is present for this purpose only where Christ causes Him to be present. For it is not the Spirit at large which thus mediates Christ, but only the Spirit of Christ Himself, the Spirit which is through Him and by Him as the Mediator between God and men, the *Man Christ Jesus.* There is, as we have seen, a wider mode of the Spirit's presence in the world, which is not dependent in the same way on the mystery of the incarnation; and that too, in its own order, is not without the presence of Christ; for everywhere, and in every mode of existence, the procession of the Holy Ghost, as the Creed has it, is from the Son no less than from the Father. As the eternal Logos or Word, Christ works in and through the working of the Spirit in the universal world of nature; according to that ancient oracle: "By the Word of Jehovah were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the Breath of His mouth." He works also in the inspirations or breathings of the Spirit, which enter into all that is high and great, whether theoretical or practical, in the natural human mind; according to that other sublime word: "In Him was life, and the life was the *light* of men." But all this in His character of the eternal Logos only, and as something back of the incarnation before it took place, or on the outside of it, and beyond it, now that it has become a glorious fact. His proper Mediatorial working is not in and by the Spirit under any such general cosmical or simply psychological view; it is circumscribed by the new relations into which He has come with the

world's life in becoming Himself man, and is held bound to the special sphere of what the presence of the Spirit among men is now in virtue of these relations. His Mediatorial presence in the world bounds the presence of the Spirit in this new mode of existence; while this, thus bounded and circumscribed (in distinction from all wider spheres of its operative power in the world), bounds at the same time the Mediatorial life from which it proceeds; constituting in this way the medium through which the glorified Son of Man continues to work among men ("Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world"), the objective home of His presence, an order of grace embosomed in the surrounding order of nature—in a word, the Church, which is His body, *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου.*

This distinction is so plain, that it is wonderful it should ever be overlooked. The Spirit of which we hear such great things in the New Testament, and which is set forth in the Creed as the fountain of the Church and all the grace comprehended in it (from the one baptism for the remission of sins out to the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting), is everywhere, not the Holy Ghost in general, but only the Holy Ghost under the new form of being, in which He has come to be among men since our human nature, in the person of Christ, passed through death, and became gloriously enthroned with Him "on the right hand of the majesty on high." And so then, there can be for us also no true evangelical being in the Spirit (birth of the Spirit, John iii. 5–8; fellowship of the Spirit, Philip. ii. 1; praying in the Spirit, Eph. vi. 18; walking in the Spirit, Gal. v. 16), which is not brought to pass through our inward conjunction in some way with the Spirit of the risen and glorified Redeemer, working in this specific form, and with such objective presence, in the Church.

Religion may be spiritual, eminently spiritual indeed, in the common acceptation of the term, without this. It may be so on the outside of Christianity altogether; as among Mohammedans, Deists, and sentimental abstractionists generally. It has been so, largely, among heretical Christian sects in all ages.

Heresy indeed has a wonderful inborn tendency always, to "begin at least in the spirit" in this way, even where it may afterwards "end in the flesh." And so it is possible also, and alas not uncommon, in the use of mainly orthodox forms of confession and belief, to resolve the power of the Gospel to a large extent into the idea of a simple sublimation or lifting up of the human spirit, through the thought of what is taken to be the general working of God's Spirit, without any reference whatever to the specific character of the Holy Ghost as mediated and brought near to men through the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh.

We may have a spirituality of this sort, that shall seem to go at times beyond the sober exercises of piety in the other form; a spirituality that shall affect to be borne above the world of sense altogether, in the way of direct communication with God; a spirituality that shall claim just on this ground to be the very power of inward, vital, experimental godliness (evangelical religion in its proper sense); while all that differs from it in the way of making earnest with the great objective verities and facts of the gospel, is denounced by it as at once unspiritual and unevangelical, a religion of forms rather than a religion of true faith.

There is a false spirituality thus, as well as a true spirituality, in the life of religion; the one the counterfeit and simulation only, in a lower sphere (human, or it may be even diabolical), of what the other is in a higher sphere; and between these, of course, it is of the utmost consequence that we should be able to make a proper distinction.

Hence that word of St. John: "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John iv. 1–3). These false prophets were spiritualistic; eminently so in their way; they felt themselves moved too by a spirit of some sort (generic and objective), which was wider than their own spirit. But both they and their inspiring genius must be proved. Try the spirits, says the aged Apostle, whether they *be of God.* And for this purpose, he offers a simple touchstone or test; decisive for the nascent Gnosticism of his own time, and no less decisive

for the pseudo-spiritualism of all later times. It is no other, in truth than that which we have had under consideration in this whole discussion; namely, the perennial undying objectivity of the Christian salvation, as holding from first to last, with the force of an endless *Now*, in the Mediatorial Life of the Incarnate Word. Here it is—dictated by Him who is the Spirit of all truth: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God." That is the criterion; the owning, or not owning, of the incarnation, as the abiding medium of the presence of Christ's Spirit in the world. For coming only through this medium, it is not possible that the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Ghost of the Gospel, should not cause the standing reality of the mystery to be felt also by every human spirit brought under His quickening and sanctifying grace.

Only the spirituality, then, which involves such a yielding of the soul to the objective force of the incarnation, and which sees this in the beginning, and the continuous ground also, of all that belongs to the Christian redemption, can be considered to be the fruit of this Spirit, and so the work of God. Any other spirituality, claiming to be evangelical, however high it may soar in its own way, is but a false spiritualism, not only different from but positively against the truth. "This is that spirit of antichrist," it is said, "whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now, already, is it in the world." The spirit of antichrist, in this view, is one; while there are, we are told, many antichrists: all resolving themselves however into this, that they own not the Holy Ghost in His only true Christian form as mediated by the coming of Christ in the flesh, but pretend to have a more spiritual Christianity in some other way; which is thus, then, substituted for the only true way of the Gospel, and set up against it also under its own name.

All false spirituality roots itself here ultimately in the denial of the great mystery of godliness, the manifestation of God in the flesh; either as open infidelity, Jewish or Pagan, seeing in it only foolishness and an offence (1 Cor. i. 23); or else as

heresy, Ebionitic or Gnostic, sundering the Divine life of Christ from His human life, by making Him to be either mere man or else no man whatever, but only the show of a man; the result in both cases being the same, that is, nothing, less than the dissipation of His true mediatorial personality into thin air.

This is the generic spirit of antichrist, which had begun to work in the way of a false Gnosticizing Christology, in the Church, before the last of the Apostles was dead; which has been the secret soul of all pseudo-evangelicalism since; and of which we may say, looking at our own time, "it is even now in the world," more completely disguised, it may be, as an angel of light, than ever before. For what less than this have we, in fact, in the reigning humanitarianism of the present age, which we find so much bent everywhere on resolving the "powers of the world to come" into a mere exaltation of the powers of the world that now is (physical, social, scientific, industrial, civilizational, educational, politico-economical, and what not), outside of the Mediatorial mystery altogether! We have only to try it by the old touchstone, the simple but potent Ithuriel spear of St. John. It owns not *ex animo* the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh. The constitution of Christ's person, is not for it the principle of all Christian faith. In one word, it has no power to feel itself at home in the APOSTLES' CREED.

Art. VII.—THE PERICOPES, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS AND EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT MERCERSBURG, PA.

NO. I.

We regard it a very favorable indication of progress in the Reformed Churches of America, that they are now directing their attention more than in past years to an examination and study of the Church Year. The old, leading festivals and fasts, which in many sections were almost entirely neglected, are coming back again. Advent, and Christmas, and Lent, and Easter are growing familiar to the ear. They are making themselves known in our hymnological collections. They are gaining respect from the world even; and here and there our Courts and trade-corporations adjourn their business over Good Friday and certain other holidays. The services also, connected with their proper observance, the lessons, and collects, and hymns, which bring continually before us those mysteries of grace in the bosom of which alone our redemption is possible, are strengthening the faith, and so moulding our religious meditations as to develop throughout the Church more than hitherto a truly healthful tone of Christian experience and thought.

In our own denomination especially, the "Order of Worship," as the result of a long and earnest liturgical discussion and study, has contributed much in this direction, and no doubt has made itself felt also in other denominations. At least it has served, and is now serving, a good purpose in confronting *us* with the reality of the Church Year,—in leading us to read and study the old appointed Gospels and Epistles, which, as we shall see,

are no random collection of Scripture passages without method or controlling principle, but on the contrary the very lessons, which the ἦθος,—the instinctive, habitual faith,—of the early Catholic Church prompted her to select.

To these lessons, in the selection of which the ancient Church has so clearly articulated her faith and method of Christian thought, we wish to call attention with the hope of encouraging that progress, the favorable indications of which we have mentioned as already existing. In doing this we must first refer to their external history, and then to their inward relations or organization, and theological significance.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE PERICOPES.

The presumptive evidence for the great antiquity of special Scripture-lessons appointed for the services of the Church is certainly very strong. Nothing can be more natural than that the Church, commissioned to teach all nations, should have given serious attention at a very early period to the method or order, in which the mysteries of divine revelation entrusted to her care should be presented, for the meditation and study of her members, in her regular and frequently recurring services. It were indeed a matter of just reproach against her, had she neglected to organize the rich material supplied her by inspiration, in the form of pertinent and instructive lessons, and in such order also as to unfold, illustrate, and impress continually upon the mind, those mysteries of grace with which, in her Creed, she was ever challenging the obedience of faith.

Further than this, we may presume also, that such selection would have a general uniformity throughout the churches as the product of the general faith of the Church, and not the result of any independent and individual compilation,—as growing in itself into a perfected organism while the cultus of the Church was in process of development, and that it would therefore follow substantially one common order or scheme, because controlled throughout by one common principle. This presumption is only the more powerful, when we bear in mind the wondrous architectonic genius of the early Church, so clearly

manifest in the magnificent structure and harmonious wholeness of the Apostles' Creed. It were strange indeed if the same constructive genius of faith should not show itself also in the services of the Church, and organize after the same general scheme and order the Church Year and its various lessons. In view of this it is no more than reasonable, we repeat, to presume that the formation of the Church Year, and all the services pertaining thereto, was only part of that one and the same general organizing and architectural work, which meets us in the growth and structure of the Creed.

As a verification of this presumption, we should expect to find the external history of the Pericopes in many respects, very similar to that of the Creed itself. We should find ourselves unable either to fasten their selection upon any particular author, or to ascertain any certain, definite date of their introduction. They would meet us as a part of the habitual life of the Church, in use here and there at a very early period, growing, and expanding, and preserving a general uniformity throughout, more marked and complete, however, when connected with the most fundamental mysteries of grace, which everywhere challenge faith, and which blossomed into festival or fast services in the general cultus of the early Church.

Now just this is the truth of history. Various attempts have been made to fix the authorship of the pericopes and the time of their introduction in their present form, but in vain. They elude all such efforts, not because they are not ancient and have no authority, but because they so inhere in the general life and practice of the Church, and are so entirely an outgrowth of this as to have authorship and date of introduction only in the fact of the existence of the Church itself.

Some, for example, have sought to maintain that fixed pericopes, the same as now in use, were already in existence in the Apostolic age, just as some have supposed that the Apostles' Creed took its definite form from the hands of the Apostles themselves. They appeal to Strabo, an authority of the ninth century, and hence of no weight in this connection. All that they can derive from his statement, however, is the general

and otherwise evident fact, that Scripture-readings were used in the churches of the Apostolic age. These of course were mostly taken from the Old Testament, the New Testament canon not yet having been organized, and followed the twofold method of selection common among the Jews, *viz:* sections from the Law (parashim), and sections from the Prophets (haphtarim), which without much doubt, when the New Testament came to be used, originated the common twofold division into Gospels and Epistles.* Of course selections from the Old Testament Scriptures could not long satisfy the needs of Christian cultus, and at a very early period the bishops of the Church must have had recourse to the acknowledged inspired writings of the New Testament. In the second century, the main festivals, Easter and Pentecost, had lessons taken directly from the New Testament narratives, and no doubt this must have been the case long before, the festivals themselves necessitating a fixed and in the main uniform selection.

Others have maintained that the present pericopes were introduced in the time of Constantine, the Great, or at least toward the end of the fourth century. Among these, some, taking for granted that the Liber Comitis, (the Lectionarium, or collection of Scripture-readings appointed at a very early date for the Western Church), is the work of St. Jerome, suppose that he became acquainted with the selections first as already in use in the East, and then recommended them to Damasus, Bishop of Rome.† Others, resting on the testimony

* That these selections from the Law and from the Prophets, whether definitely fixed for each recurring Sabbath or not, were used in the time of the Apostles in the Jewish synagogues, is quite evident from the passage in Acts xiii. 15, "They went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and after the reading of the Law and the prophets, &c."—Those called *parashim* were evidently designed, as may be inferred from their number, to cover the Sabbaths during the year. Those selected from the second part of the Old Testament canon, the *nebhiim* were no doubt in most cases related to the former as read in connection with them. The *capitula*, which Jerome mentions as existing, with some variations, both in the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old Testament in his day, were probably these selections. See Bleek's Einleitung A. T. s. 750, ssq. and Augusti's Denkwürdigkeiten a. d. Christl. Archäologie, Sexster B. s. 105, ssq.

† This Liber Comitis is certainly very ancient, although there seems to be no sufficient evidence for regarding it the work of St. Jerome. If the prologue to this work

of Gennadius (490†), maintains that Musæus, presbyter at Marseilles (458), first collected them.*

The Reformed divines, and many Lutherans also, influenced by their opposition to what they regarded the corrupted cultus of the Roman Catholic Church, and by their effort toward freedom from what they felt to be a tyrannical restraint, looked upon the whole idea of select lessons prescribed for the Sundays of the year with great distrust.† They maintained, misled by

---

addressed to Constantius be in reality the work of St. Jerome, then, as the Glossary of Du Cange and the Benedictine Monks declares, the work itself must have had its title long before Jerome. But, without admitting this prologue to be genuine, the same Glossary maintains that the book must have been written under its title *Comes*, before the year 471, because mention is made of it in a certain Church record of that year —"Utcumque sit de prologi auctore, constat eam Lectionario inditam ac receptam nomenclaturam an. 471, ex Charta Donationis Ecclesiæ Cornutianæ hoc anno scripta, et edita a Suaresio, "*item codicis, Evangelia* 4, *Apostolum, Psalterium, et Comitem.*" (See Gloss. Du Cange, sub voce). In Migne's edition of the works of St. Jerome, (Cursus Com. Patrol, Tom. xxx.), this Liber Comitis is given. There is also a synopsis of its Sunday pericopes in the (pericoparum conspectus) added to the second volume of Daniel's Codex Liturgicus. It is difficult to determine what gave the work its peculiar title. Some think it arose from the fact, that the book was regarded as a necessary companion or count of the priest; as Phocas Grammaticus says,

"Te longinqua petens Comitem sibi ferre viator
Ne dubitet; parvo pondere multa vehis,"

others that it was written *ad* Comitem, as seen in the ancient manuscripts. (Vid. Du Cange sub voce *Comes*).

* Gennadius says of Musæus: "Excerpsit de scripturis lectiones totius anni festivis diebus aptas. Responsaria Psalmorum, capitula temporibus et lectionibus congruentia" (quoted by Augusti: Denkw. B. VI. s. 143.)

† Calvin went so far as to regard the pericopes *silly* selections made without any judgment: "*Lectiones istæ inepte nulloque judicio factæ.*" The general cycle of the Church Year, however, found entrance to a great extent into the cultus of the Reformed Church, although there were many who felt a strong opposition to any thing like prescribed lessons from Scripture as adapted thereto. Spener says "Wie hertzlich wünschte ich, dass wir in unseren Kirchen niemalen den Gebrauch der pericoparum evangelicarum angenommen hätten, sondern entweder freie Wahl gelassen, oder die epistolas vor die Evangelia zu Haupttexten genommen hätten." G. Arnold goes beyond Calvin even in his hatred of the pericopes. He calls the selection, "Eine ruchlose und gräuliche Verstümmelung der Bibel." Ebrard rightly assumes that the observance of the leading Church festivals has always been a generally acknowledged element of the cultus of the Reformed Church; and he expresses the wish, that there should be a farther advance in such form, that these festivals may not stand isolated, but be connected with each other, forming festival seasons in which there shall be a properly mediated transition from one to the other. We must insert his own language, as we shall have frequent occasion to refer to it here-

the force of their antagonism with Rome, that the pericopes date no farther back than the eighth century; some attributing their collection to Bede (735†); others to Alcuin or Paul Warniefried, under direction of Charlemagne. There were those indeed who went still further, assigning their origin to the eleventh or twelfth centuries, on the ground that such selections could have originated only at a period, when the Holy Scriptures themselves were but little read. (See Augusti's Denkw. B. VI. s. 201, sq.)

It must be plain from the above divergent theories, how unsatisfactory and unavailing it is to attempt to fix in any such mechanical way a definite authorship or date of introduction for the pericopes now in use. But it does not follow from this, by any means, that their authority and antiquity are subjects of no account. On the contrary, it may be found that their authority is derived from the general practice of the Church, this practice reaching down to the very earliest period, quite uniform so far as it extended, and gradually by legitimate growth becoming organized into a fixed scheme such as manifested itself at a later date in the several *Lectionaria* of the various sections of the Church. An origination of this character certainly gives to the pericopes far more importance, and far greater weight of authority than any individual authorship can, however exalted. The existence of several Lectionaria, all following the same general scheme, for example, the *Menologium Constantinopolitanum*, the *Lectionarium Gallicanum*, the *Liber Comitis*, and the *Callendarium Romanum*, very clearly proves that, long before their separate publication, the general practice of the Church had furnished the material out of which they originated.

Imagine for a moment, that Jerome, or Musæus, or Alcuin, or Bede formed such a collection of lessons, covering not only

---

after. "Eine Fortbildung wäre es, wenn das Kirchenjahr nicht mehr wie bisher, in eine unterbrochene Reihe gewöhnlicher Sonntage, zwischen denen dann die Feste wie isolirte und unvermittelte Punkte hervorragten, sondern statt dessen in Festperioden (Adventszeit, Epiphaniaszeit, Passionszeit, u. s. w.) zerfiele, deren jede den Uebergang von einem Feste zum andern bildete; und wenn diese Beziehung des Kirchenjahres auf den wirklichen ganzen Jahreslauf sich auch in dem Cultus ausspräche." See Daniel's Cod. Lit. Tom. 2.

the Sundays of the year, but the feria, and festivals and martyr-days, when nothing of the kind had fixed itself in the general habit of the Church before! Who cannot see at once how impossible it would be to introduce such a collection from diocese to diocese throughout the Church, when Catholic tradition and custom had all the authority of common law, and to accomplish this too without one syllable of earnest protest, or without any intimation of resistance? It is absurd. These Lectionaria could not, of themselves, have introduced the practice as something before unknown, but rather the general custom already existing necessitated their formation to serve its own ends. The Lectionaria themselves, as we shall see, give clear evidence of this.

Augusti, in his valuable work on Christian antiquities (vol. vi. p. 211), has given a carefully prepared synopsis of part of the four works just mentioned above. From an examination of this synopsis, the close uniformity of the pericopes and other Scripture readings connected with the ancient and leading festivals of the Church, is plainly observable. Take for example the Epiphany festival, undoubtedly of extreme antiquity, which, while referring back to the Nativity and Circumcision of Christ,* included the adoration of the Wise men led by the miraculous star, the baptism at Jordan, and the first miracle at Cana. Here the uniformity is complete in all the general features. The pericopes for Circumcision are in the Menologium, Luke ii. 21–40; in the Liber Comitis, Luke ii. 21–32; in the Lectionarium Gall., Luke ii. 21–40, including an Epistle, 1 Cor. x. 14–31; in the Callendarium Rom., Luke ii. 21–32. For Epiphany, in the Menolog., Matt. iii. 13–17 (the Baptism); in the Lib. Com. Matt. ii. 1-12 (the adoration of the Wise men, with an octave, however, taking up the Baptism); in the Lect. Gall., Matt. iii. 13–17, combined with John ii. (the first miracle); in the Callend. Rom., Matt. ii. 1–12.

It is plain that the uniformity here manifest has its ground

* No doubt, at an early period, the Epiphany feast in the East was made identical with that of the Nativity. In the Menologium Const. it is thus referred to: "εις την ημεραν των αγιων θεοφανιων." In the Liber Comitis it is called *Theophania.*

in the early and wide-spread custom of the Church, and not in any individual and arbitrary compilation imposed by this one or that one—a custom too contemporaneous, we may say, with the observance of the festival itself, which grouped around it a cluster of pericopes of uniform character, as seen above. This is further and more fully confirmed the moment we examine the homilies of the early Fathers.

Among the sermons ascribed to St. Ambrose, there is one which shows at once how it came that the singular epistle selection, 1 Cor. x. 14–31, found its way into the Lectionarium Gall. for Circumcision. This selection, as may be seen by examination, brings into view the striking contrast between the Gentile sacrificial and idolatrous festivity, and the Christian's communion through the Eucharist, with the sacrifice of Christ. There seems to be here no connection whatever between the Circumcision of Christ, and this exhortation of St. Paul; and what custom of the Church could have made such a selection of any general force in reference to the day? Just this. Around the opening of January there was quite a cluster of Gentile feasts. Among the Romans were the celebrated Saturnalia, covering some seven days, followed by the Laurentalia, and then again after the Calends, the Agonalia. On the Calends itself there was a wild riotous festival in honor of Janus, and Strenia, the goddess of presents, and the day was given up to feastings and banquetings, and revelry. Christians were guarded against all this by very severe canons of several councils, and by the earnest watchfulness of their Pastors. In the sermon referred to,* as also in one for the same season from Augustine,† the hearers are at once reminded of the necessary contrast between their festivity and that of the Gentiles, and are told that those who wish to be partakers of the Divine, should hold no fellowship with idols, for the portion of idols is drunkenness, gluttony and dance. Augustine, indeed, in bringing out the same contrast, refers to this very chapter in Corinthians. There can be but

* Migne's Cur. Com. Patrol. Tom. XVII. p. 618.
† Ibid. Tom. XXXVIII. p. 1025.

little doubt that just this need of enforcing such contrast in view of the surrounding heathenism originated, long before Ambrose, the use of such a lesson as this as well as that one of kindred character in the same Lectionarium for Epiphany, *viz.*, Titus i. 11 to the end.

But further than this, the sermons for Epiphany, as given in the volumes of Migne's edition just referred to, uniformly take up the *first miracle*, the *baptism in Jordan*, and *the adoration of the wise men*, showing that these were the themes belonging to the season by the general consent and practice of the whole Western Church. The same is the case with the Church of the East. In fact the Epiphany season formed a sort of nucleus from the very start, gathering around it just those pericopes which meet us fully organized in Lectionaria at later date. They grew into their position and order with the advancing cultus of the Church, and were not by any means, as Calvin intimates, *inepte nulloque judicio factæ*.

What we have now said of Epiphany is equally true of the Paschal festival, which is coeval, we may say, with the Church itself; and which gathered around it a cluster of pericopes, all taking up the same general themes, as seen in the earliest homilies, and in the comparative synopsis of the earliest collections. So also the transition from the one festival season to the other follows the same general order. The Paschal season itself included properly both the death and resurrection of Christ, the Pascha *σταυρωσιμον*, and the Pascha *αναστασιμον*. The former naturally connected with itself the old quadragesimal fast; and the latter found its fitting completion in the festival of Pentecost. Thus from the Nativity onward through Epiphany and the Quadragesimal fast and the Paschal Season to Pentecost, a general scheme of pericopes, closely connected with the services of the Church, originated, at first most uniform in character and most ancient in those parts immediately surrounding the main festivals, yet gradually, through the practice of the Church, becoming organized throughout into a full system, such as meets us at a later date, and such as has come down to our times.

That which determined the festivals and their order in the Church Year, must have determined also the pericopes connected therewith. For, granting the early existence of festival seasons (and this early existence is beyond all question), it were strange indeed that the services relating thereto, in prayers, and chants, and collects, and in the whole tone of worship, should be of uniform character in harmony with the Season, while the Scripture-lessons should be selected at random, and thus be made to enter as so many discordant notes into the otherwise grand liturgical harmony. No one at all acquainted with the Catholic character of the early Church, its wondrous constructive genius as seen in its creeds and liturgies and special services, resting upon the same base throughout, however great the seeming variety, uniting simplicity with grandeur, a sense of the repose of love in heaven with the restless aspirations of faith on earth—no one at all acquainted with this, we repeat, can for a moment conceive the possibility of such an incongruity. Hence it is, as by necessity grounding itself in the general life and habit of the Church, that the old collection of pericopes which have come down to us are so uniform in just those parts, where the lessons cluster around the great festival epochs of the Church service.

But what now determined the order of the great festivals, their sequence, which is ever the same? No variety here manifests itself. There may be some difference in regard to the specific date of observing this or that festival. We know of the controversy in regard to the time of observing Easter, which disturbed the Church long before it entered into the discussions of the first general council at Nicæa. But this controversy only reveals the peculiar uniformity of which we speak, relating to the festivals, not as single days of observance merely, but as so many centres of cycles or periods, governing what goes before and what follows after; for the difficulty about the time of observing Easter grew in great measure out of the felt incongruity that one section of the Church should be engaged in the Easter rejoicings, while another might be in the fast which uniformly preceded it. It is almost profane to imagine,

that the order or sequence of these festivals was a matter of individual imposition. The objective mystery of the divine revelation in Christ Jesus, as apprehended by the faith of the Church, determined it. Just as the reality of Christ's historical presence in the world necessitated the general order of the Gospels, moving on as they do from the annunciation to the birth, and circumcision, and baptism, and temptation, and suffering, and death, and resurrection, and ascension, closing the grand series only to open the way for the consequent pentecost; and just as the same all controlling mystery, finding a primal authentication for itself among men in the response of Peter's faith, "*Thou art the Christ*," and expanding therefrom, and following its own logic not of flesh and blood, necessitated the sublime order of the Creed: just so the self-same mystery authenticated its presence in the cultus of the Church, making it *Christocentric*, and controlling the sequence referred to, in service and in lessons, as a part of the same grand and heavenly harmony. Whatever may be our view as to whether or not such *should have been* the cultus of the Church, the fact that it *was* such is, we think, beyond all question.

But we must not anticipate here what we are to say in reference to the inward relation and theological significance of the pericopes, although the inward and outward here are so married together as to make any separation very difficult. We wish to know first whether the pericopes which meet us in the old collections, and in the homilies of the early Fathers, both for Sundays and the Festivals, are in the main the same as those now in use.

We cannot better introduce this subject than by quoting what Augusti says in reference to it (Denkw. ch. vi. s. 235). "If we wish to reach any settled result in reference to this point, we must answer the two following questions. 1. Among our present festival and Sunday epistles and gospels, are there any of which the Church from the fourth to the ninth centuries knew nothing? In general the answer to this question must be negative. The only exceptions are those which relate to certain special festivals of a later introduction. To this category

belong: (*a*) the Trinity festival. Here the contents of both gospel and epistle with us show that they had reference originally to another day and dogma, and hence the Roman Church has selected the more suitable reading (Matt. xxviii. 18–20):* (*b*) the visitation of the Virgin, introduced only in the fifteenth century; (*c*) the feast of Michael, the origin and celebration of which is obscure; (*d*) most of the *particular* festivals of the Roman and Greek Churches, among which, however, some are of a great age; for we find fixed Bible-texts selected for them already in antiquity. Leaving out of view these newly added festivals, all our present pericopes occur in the lectionaria, menologia, and homilies of the ancient Church."

2. "Do our present pericopes agree throughout as to the days for which the early Church appointed them? The answer here is negative: yet we remark that a deviation in the Festivals is very rare, but more frequent for the Sundays. The ground of this is to be sought in the changed division and naming of the Sundays, and hence we find less conformity in the Advent and Epiphany Sundays and in some of the Trinity Sundays. The difference as to the festivals is to be explained by the fact, that one, two, three, and four days were devoted to these occasions. In many cases nothing more has been done than to exchange and transpose the festival pericopes. Moreover the difference is greater in the Epistles than in the Gospels." So far the carefully considered statement of Augusti.

Now it may be seen by any one, who will examine the matter, that, where there is a difference of pericopes in reference to the festivals, there is, notwithstanding this, a striking uniformity in the general bearing or scope of each as related to the main theme which the festival presents. We have seen this already in regard to Epiphany, where always we find the same group of pericopes clustering around what the Church felt to be the idea of the Epiphany festival. So in the Trinity festival, to which Augusti refers in the passage above quoted, and where his statement requires to be modified. It should be borne in mind

* We think that Augusti here has misunderstood the meaning of Trinity Sunday as related to Pentecost, which presently we shall endeavor to show.

that this Trinity Sunday was originally regarded the octave of Pentecost. It is called in the Liber Comitis "*Dominica octab. Pentecosten.*" One of the main designs of an *Octave* was to bring out still further the full significance of the festival to which it was attached, to carry the festival to its proper completion in the service of the Church, called indeed by the Greeks on this account *απολυσιν*. Therefore here the descent of the Holy Ghost, the pentecost mystery, is viewed as opening the way for the reality of a true spiritual birth, the ingathering through baptism of the first fruits of a glorious spiritual harvest, and hence the Gospel lesson in the Liber Comitis (John iii. 1, sq.)—the same as in the Anglican and Evangelical Churches—takes up the annunciation to Nicodemus of just this supernatural reality. The Roman Church also sees the full significance of the Pentecost festival realizing itself in the commission to go forth and baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Matt. xxviii. 18 sq.),—a lesson which, while it is in proper relation to Pentecost, as its octave, takes into view at the same time the authentication in us of the mystery of the Trinity by our implantation therein through baptism. Here the Gospel lessons are outwardly different it is true; yet they have a profound inward harmony. The further lessons for Trinity Sunday in the Liber Comitis, *viz.* (Rev. iv. 1–11, which occurs in the Anglican Church and in our Order of Worship), and Acts v. 29 sq., beautifully appropriate (which, although given in the synopsis of Daniel, I cannot find in the copy of the Lib. Com. in Migne's edition of Jerome), plainly refer to the antecedent festival, wherein the whole mystery of inspiration and of the forgiveness of sins finds its authorship. The Epistle in the Roman Church (Rom. xi. 33, sq.), is somewhat obscure, but seems to have indirectly reference to the Trinity. The difference here is certainly more formal than real. The harmony is inward, and expressive of just that transition, which is at this point made in the service, from the objective fact-mysteries of revelation to the subjective life-mysteries in us, we may call them, which the former open the way for and accomplish.

From the octave of Pentecost onward to the twenty-fourth Trinity Sunday inclusive, the pericopes in the old Liber Comitis are uniformly the same as those in our 'Order of Worship,' the only difference being in not always commencing with just the same verse of the chapter. In the Roman Church there is a great variation from the old collection. Daniel takes occasion to refer to this in the following words: "Contra pericoparum ordo (post Trin.) apud Catholicos valde turbatus est: nunquam enim ea epistola juncta est Evangelio, quam antiqui cum pericopa evangelica junxere. Itaque in vanum laborant, qui his Dominicis epistolam cum Evangelio πνευματικῷ quodam commercio cohærere ostendere conantur." The number of the post-pentecostal Sundays being variable from year to year makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain from the Lectionaria what regulation may have been used in the early period in regard to the pericopes to be used or neglected. The same is true of the post-epiphany Sundays. Here, therefore, as might be expected, we shall meet with variations; yet the general scheme of the year is uniform, and has no doubt a controlling principle which regulates and organizes it from beginning to end. It is to this that we must now turn, as we discuss more directly than hitherto the inward relation or organization of the pericopes and their theological significance.

The festival pericopes, as already remarked, are determined in their general character by the nature of the festivals themselves. They are designed, both in Gospel and Epistle, to develop the festival idea in the fullness of its significance. The importance of the special mystery which the festival celebrates, often and indeed we may say always, requires for this end several consecutive Sundays, some going before and some following after, all of which however taken together constitute a festival cycle or period. We have already mentioned the octave following after. We may now add the fact that there were vigils going before, and that the festival about to rise keeps wakeful with its dawning light those whom it is to warm and cherish when arisen.

For example, the festival of the Nativity, which properly opens and conditions, as we shall see, the whole movement of the Church-year,* constitutes a cycle of pericopes going before, viz.: those for Advent Sundays, and a cycle following after, viz.: those for Epiphany Sundays, of which it is itself the centre. Those going before mark the transition from the close of the Church-year to its beginning again, and join together in proper harmony the two Advents, the *second* which completes the Pentecostal mystery to the *first* which is the commencement in time of the same heavenly æon, and toward which in the transition the pericopes with growing clearness direct the faith and devotion of the Church. They do not take up the mystery itself, but the proper preparatory attitude of mankind in view of its certain and hastening approach, and of what it involves, which is the uniform character of the pericopes when thus preparatory and transitional. The lessons following after for Epiphany Sundays, the old Theophany cycle, *αγια φωτα*, as the Greeks call it, take up the mystery of the Nativity in its self-unfolding and authentication as that in which alone the whole meaning of the theophany is made real.

It is plain, however, that the Advent pericopes involve something more than a mere design upon the part of the Church to join together mechanically the two Advents, so that the transition may not in the service be too abrupt. There is in reality a necessary inward relation here, which the Ancient Church very clearly saw. In the vision of faith the two Advents interpenetrate each other. The coming of Christ in the flesh, as an absolute revelation, calls up at once the reality of an absolute crisis in the whole sphere of our human life,—a crisis in which there are on the one hand, life and peace and

---

* The Liber Comitis commences, "*In vigilia natalis Domini.*" The Lectionarium Gallicanum begins no doubt with the Advent preparation for the Nativity, as Mabillon maintains. The first part is lost. Chrysostom well expresses the general sentiment of the Church in this regard, showing how instinctively in the faith of the Church, the mystery of Christ's coming in the flesh ruled the whole festival consecration of time in the Sanctuary services. "*πρωτη εορτη και ριζα και αρχη και εορτων εορτη και μετροπολις πασων εορτων*,"—the first feast, the root and beginning and feast of feasts, yea the metropolis of all feasts.

glory, and on the other, condemnation and endless death; and just as the whole of time preceding the Incarnation is one anxious vigil awaiting the great Deliverer, so, after the Ascension and Pentecost, all subsequent time is one anxious vigil awaiting and preparing for the completed deliverance, when Christ shall come again to judge the quick and dead. Faith never holds the two apart in antithesis, but together in a sublime synthesis, the ethical significance of which is of vast account. It is this which the Advent pericopes uniformly reveal as the mind of the early Church. The old Prophets in inspired vision saw the two Advents as one, and seemed to have realized the profound truth, that the coming of Christ in the flesh was to be the real entrance of that last time for which their prophetic spirit yearned; and at all times it is an instinctive impulse of faith to regard every epoch of the Church and every judgment upon the world, as parts of that coming of Christ, who ever confronts us as the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and end of the whole movement of history.

Still further, no one can fail to see in the Advent pericopes, that the Church realized the full significance of the Incarnation as related to Judaism and Heathenism, as the very hinge indeed of the whole movement of the world's life. How beautifully does the sense of this comprehensiveness of the mystery show itself in the selection of the Gospel for the first Advent Sunday, which, at the very threshold, as soon as the Church is made in its services to look toward His coming,* rightfully challenges from every antecedent effort of humanity the response, "Hosanna to the Son of David; blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest!" How organically also, we may say, is the Epistle-lesson joined

* As in the *Invitatory*, "O come let us worship; the Lord our King is coming;" as in the old *Antiphon*, "Behold the mighty King shall come with great power to save the nations. Hallelujah"; as in the old *lection* from Isaiah and the *response*, "I look afar off, and behold I see the power of God coming, and a cloud covering the whole earth. Go ye forth to meet Him, and say: Tell us whether Thou be He, who shall rule over the people Israel." It is well to connect the pericopes with the other parts of the liturgical service of the Ancient Church, to see their peculiar significance, or rather the purpose of their selection.

to this revealing what the Church felt to be the necessary inward ethical condition of such a welcome, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us, therefore, cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light!"

So again for the second Sunday of Advent, how instinctively, in the selection of the Gospel (Luke xxi. 25 sq.), is the incoming redemption felt to be related to the awful crisis of judgment which it necessitates, and which is all the while a sign of its reality; and how in the selection of the corresponding Epistle-lesson, the now approaching fulfillment of the promises made unto the Fathers is felt mercifully to include the Gentiles and to save them from the terrible crisis, "Rejoice ye Gentiles with His people; * * * There shall be a root of Jesse, and He shall rise to reign over the Gentiles: in Him shall the Gentiles trust" (Rom. xv. 4 sq.). In the Gospel-lesson for the third Sunday in Advent, we advance to the special preparatory mission of John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 2 sq), where its supernatural character and purport is portrayed by the Saviour Himself, over against the anxiety of the imprisoned prophet, and the possibly false judgment occasioned thereby among the disciples of the Saviour. The Baptist's judgment, from the standpoint of the Old, could not, of course, reach into the clearness of intuition enjoyed in the Kingdom of Grace in the New, yet his unwavering fidelity to his mission, which had caused his imprisonment and which would soon cost him his head is beautifully defended by Christ.

"Non arundo levitatis
Sed columna firmitatis."

To this again the Epistle at once links itself with peculiar appropriateness (1 Cor. iv. 1 sq.), showing that the mysteries of a divinely appointed ministry are not matters of self-determination and judgment merely, to be measured empirically by outward circumstances, but are so lodged in Him for whom and by whom the ministry is constituted, as to be revealed only by His coming, "Therefore, judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart;

and then shall every man have praise of God." In the Gospel lesson for the concluding Advent Sunday, the herald of the coming Christ, as the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, proclaims to the Jewish deputies that the Holy One standeth in their midst. (This Gospel-lesson should close with the 28th verse of John i., as it does in the Liber Comitis, instead of taking up the proper Epiphany-lesson by continuing to the 35th verse, as in our "Order of Worship.") In the corresponding Epistle-lesson, every feature marks that we have come to the very close of the preparatory series just as in the lesson of the Gospel. Here then, in the Advent cycle, controlled entirely by the coming Nativity, we have a perfect symmetry of lessons, a perfect, yea exquisite harmony of parts throughout.

Let us turn to the cycle of Epiphany pericopes following after the Nativity. These mark the method by which the mystery of the Nativity comes to its proper manifestation and authentication among men, the Gospel-lessons taking up the objective attestation and manifestation of the mystery itself, and the Epistle-lessons generally what may be called the subjective, the attestation and manifestation in the life of those in whom the mystery is operative. In the oldest collections, as already remarked, the pericopes for Epiphany take up either the *baptism in Jordan*, or the *wise men led by the miraculous star*, or the *first miracle at Cana*. The order in the Liber Comitis down to the fifth Sunday after Epiphany is the same as that in our "Order of Worship," except the Epiphany Epistle, which is Isaiah lx. 1 sq., instead of Eph. iii. 1 sq. (a change which seems to have been first made by the Anglican Church alone). By an examination it will be seen that the order of the Gospel lessons is as follows: the attestation of the star and the adoration of the wise men; the presentation at the Temple and the discussion with the doctors; the miracle at Cana; and then, in connection with this, Christ's self-manifestation in work (miracles) and in word (parables). It were strange, however, should the old collection of pericopes in the Liber Comitis neglect the

scene of the baptism, so closely related to the idea involved in Epiphany. It does not indeed, for as a proper consummation of that divine attestation from above, commencing with the miraculous star, and which its Epiphany Gospel brought into view, it adds with instinctive faith a completing octave of Epiphany (octabas theophaniæ), with the very lesson required, viz.: John i. 29–34.

This gives to the Gospel-series its proper and matchless harmony, 1st, the attestation from on high, at the birth and at the baptism; 2d, the self-manifestation or attestation from within, commencing in childhood at the Temple, and expanding into miraculous work and word, and these of most fundamental and prophetic character, as no one can well fail to perceive. The miracle at Cana, foreshadowing the transmuting and glorifying power of His mission in the world, transforming the wants and crude elementary supplies of earthly life into the abundance and sparkling festal freshness of heaven; the healing of the leprous and the palsied one, the Israelite and Roman centurion, prefiguring that redemption through faith, which shall deliver mankind from the leprous-dying of sin, and the palsied helplessness of this life; the rebuking of the winds and waves, bringing to view the hallowed universal truth that the eternal repose of His life in God shall calm all the agitations of nature, and bring the wide world into the sabbatic peace of heaven; what an Epiphany glory there is in this cluster of prophetic, theophanic miracles! The parable also following these miracles and forming in our collection the Gospel-lesson for the fifth Epiphany Sunday (Matt. xiii. 24 sq.) is not inappropriate, but does not so profoundly relate itself to the series, as the Gospel-lesson in the old Liber Comitis, (Matt. xi. 25 sq.) where the Epiphany of the Son is the Epiphany of the Father. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." The last Epiphany Gospel in our collection, which brings us to the transition to suffering, anticipates the glorious

consummation of Epiphany in the resurrection, by leading us with the chosen three to the mount of His transfiguration.*

It is generally more difficult to perceive the relation which the Epistles hold to the festival mystery, and to the gospels as unfolding it; yet, when we find ourselves unable to discover such relation, we ought by no means to conclude that it has no existence; but we should rather make the Epistle in question a matter of earnest study, upon the warranted presumption that the logic of the faith of the Church gave it its place not arbitrarily, but with a purpose as yet too profound perhaps for our apprehension. Such study will amply reward us, as the experience of any one who has made the effort will testify.

Take the Epiphany series of epistles, in their relation to the Epiphany mystery and to the corresponding gospels. The Epiphany gospel, as said, refers us at once to the adoration of the wise men, as led by the star and by the prophecies interpreted at Jerusalem to the manger at Bethlehem. How beautifully related to this is the old epistle lesson taken from Isaiah lx. 1 sq., bringing to view the glory of the Church in the fact that the Gentiles shall come to her light, and kings to the brightness of her rising. "The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; all they from Sheba shall come: they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord."

> "Reges magi, qui non vagi,
> Sed præsagi, guadent agi
> Stella duce prævia."

Gustave Dore, in his sketch of this, has most charmingly

---

* The pericopes for this sixth Sunday after Epiphany rarely occur in the old collections. It is wanting in the Liber Comitis. The Roman Church has for the Gospel-lesson, Matt. xiii. 3 sq.; the Anglican Church, Matt. xxiv. 23 sq., (no doubt because the concluding Epiphany pericopes are resumed to fill out when required between the 23d and 24th Sundays after Trinity, this latter being made always to conclude the post Trinity Sundays. Our "Order of Worship" follows here the selection of the Ecclesia Evangelica. (See the '*pericoparum conspectus*' in Daniel's Cod. Lit. Tom. 2.) The Epistles for this Sunday are, for the Ecclesia Romana, 1 Thess. i. 2 sq.; for the Ecclesia Anglicana, 1 John iii. 1 sq.; for the Ecclesia Evangelica, 2 Pet. i. 16 sq.

caught and expressed the sentiment of the old Church, in the kingly procession, dromedaries and attending servants, moving grandly and steadily onward, led and illumined by the glorious star. So also the Epistle (Ephesians iii. 1 sq.,) which our 'Order of Worship' has accepted, in place of the old, from the Anglican Church, is plainly controlled in its selection by the same thought and faith, directing at once to the mystery hitherto hidden, but now revealed, "that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel." The manger at Bethlehem is felt to be the centre where not only the old prophecy is fulfilled, but where the theophany is of such absolute character as to comprehend within its light our whole humanity. The Gospel and Epistle here form one grand epiphany chord in the rhythmic harmony of the Church Year.

We find the same to be the case with the next Epiphany Sunday. The Gospel, as said, has now led us from the manger to the Temple, from the attestation from above to the attestation from within. At the feast of the Passover, Jesus now twelve years old is presented, and begins to give utterance to the mystery of His divine paternity, asking and answering questions among the marvelling doctors, and casting into the pondering depths of his mother's heart, in reply to her exclamation, "Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing," the solemn counter-statement, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" Now the epistle (Romans xii. 1 sq.), has seized upon the very substance of the gospel lesson, and joins with its own accordant note, bringing to mind our consecration at the altar, and the fact that we must not be conformed to the order of this life, but transformed in the renewing of our minds. The natural paternity which links us to this world must give way before the hallowed mystery of our supernatural paternity in grace, which comes to an attestation within us in that unselfishness, which subordinates all thought of self and its relations, to that measure of faith which God hath dealt, that God may be all and in all.

We cannot go through each lesson separately. Enough has

now been written to show, that the festival forms a cycle of pericopes mutually related to each other and to the mystery which the festival celebrates, and that just what Ebrard desires, as before quoted in a note, has been already accomplished, and this too for ages. It must be apparent also with what instinct of faith the Church Year is made to rest at its very start upon the mystery of the divine self-manifestation in Christ. This controls at the beginning, and through the whole movement, so that the year follows the order of the Creed not arbitrarily, but of necessity, as a kindred utterance of the Christian consciousness of the Church. "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary" constitutes the Nativity festival, which links to itself the consequent grand epiphany of His glory among men.

"Natus est Rex gloriæ:
Ad quem reges ambulabant
Aurum, thus, myrrham portabant:
Hæc sincerè immolabant
Leoni victoriæ."

But just as the Creed next takes up the mystery of suffering and death, the humiliation reaching out to the exaltation, so now, in the Church Year, this must form the transition reaching over to the Easter festival. Indeed Epiphany with the Nativity forms the first exulting major chord of the Easter Anthem, which before the minor of Lent comes in, must send its aspiring tones forward to anticipate the rapturous conclusion, as it does in the last Epiphany lesson in our "Order of Worship" where *in the Gospel* the transfiguration, to change the figure, shines forth a heralding star of the coming resurrection, and where *in the Epistle*, the illumined consciousness of sonship strives to grasp what we shall be in glory when we shall see Him as He is.

The humiliation of Christ, who "learned obedience by the things which he suffered" necessarily connects with itself our humiliation, constituting therefore not a festival but a fast,—a season of special detachment from the life of the world,—a season in which the joyousness of festival faith in view of the Nativity and Epiphany gives place to that penitential contrition and me-

ditation, which the same faith necessitates when the mystery of a suffering and dying Saviour challenges its vision. We have already referred to the old quadragesimal fast. It is impossible definitely to fix its antiquity, as including a fixed forty days of ante-paschal fasting. At first, and probably without any certain limit of days or hours, it grew forth from the general faith of the Church, which connected by a universal habit, self-humiliation and penitence with the season immediately preceding Easter, because at this time especially the sufferings and death and burial of Christ were brought into view. At a very early period, however, it limited itself as a penitential season to forty days, and the Sundays included within this period were denominated Sundays in Quadragesima. Also as preparatory to this season, and as forming a proper transition from Epiphany to it, we find at a very early period the Sundays in Septuagesima, in Sexagesima, and in Quinquagesima, that is, Sundays included in way of preparation within the penitential season.

It is not our purpose here to discuss the reasons of such limitation in number of days, but only to mention that the idea of this ante-paschal season has its ground and justification in that instinctive faith-feeling of the early Church, which connected with the mystery of Christ's suffering the necessity of our self-humiliation and penitence, and to show that the pericopes, while referring on the one hand to the objective mystery as in the Creed, refer also on the other hand to the consequent necessity of a subjective, inward self-mortification, and that they are in their progressive series mutually related, and directed steadily to that consummation of obedient sacrifice which confronts us in the crucifixion and death and burial of Jesus, giving us the same exquisite rhythmical harmony as in the Epiphany cycle.

Septuagesima Sunday begins the preparation for Lent, and here the Epiphany series of pericopes commences its transition. The objective mysteries of Christ's sufferings, as revealed in that conflict by which in the end He wrested the keys of death and hades from the Adversary, do not of course yet come into view. They are reserved for the proper Lent Sundays. Pericopes

preparatory and in transition do not, as we have said, take up the mystery to which they turn, but rather the proper preparatory attitude in view of its approach and what it involves. Hence, inasmuch as in the transition now beginning, the Epiphany of Christ is viewed as moving forward into the terrible conflict with darkness, necessitating for the victory of redemption a pathway through suffering and death, the lessons now, no longer festival but penitential and preparatory to a survey of Christ's struggles with the devil and his works, take up the solemn admonitions that our manifestation of Christian life must be in work and warfare, in struggle and trials and temptations, and that the way of life is the way of the Cross.

"Nulla salus est in domo,
Nisi cruce munit homo,
Superliminaria."

The first gospel lesson (Matt. xx. 1, sq.), represents the Lord of the vineyard gathering in all idlers, that they may *work* for their hire. Christians are to be *laborers*, and the lesson concludes with the fearful warning, "Many be called but few chosen." The epistle (1 Cor. ix. 24 sq.) emphasizes the same truth, presenting Christians as engaged in a race for an incorruptible crown—a crown to be gained only by most arduous self-discipline and watchfulness, in the midst of which there is at all times great danger of failure. St. Paul represents himself as in fearful conflict, keeping under his body and bringing it into subjection, lest he himself should be a cast-away, and cites from the history of the old covenant the fact that *all* were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and *all* did eat the same spiritual meat, and *all* did drink the same spiritual drink, but *many were* overthrown in the wilderness. The Sexagesima gospel lesson (Luke viii. 4 sq.) still further presses the same solemn theme, by selecting the parable in which the seed lavishly sown is in imminent danger of becoming unfruitful, and even when fruitful, the fruit is brought forth with patience. The epistle (2 Cor. xi. 19 sq.) gives an epitome of the heroic martyr-life of St. Paul, enduring every manner of hardship and trial, buffeted by men and by

the devil, yet glorying in his sufferings and infirmities as opening the way for the power of Christ to rest upon him. The Quinquagesima gospel lesson, as concluding the preparatory Sundays, casts a glance into the coming mystery upon which the whole fast is based, by bringing before us Christ as He informs the twelve of His going up to Jerusalem to be delivered up, and mocked and spitefully entreated, and spitted on, and scourged, and put to death,—a marvel of voluntary love for humanity, hidden from the disciples even, because as yet they could not grasp the hallowed mystery. The epistle (1 Cor. xiii. 1 sq.) is the magnificent poem of St. Paul on charity, which nothing but just such a reality of life and transcendent love in the person of Jesus could have inspired, a life of charity, long-suffering and kind, bearing all things, believing all things, hoping all things, enduring all things, and abiding forever in its own absolute perfection, in the wilderness, in Gethsemane, and on the Cross, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

How beautiful the harmony of the whole series! What wondrous appreciation too of that which the struggling spirit requires, does the selection of the closing lesson evince, giving the firm base of strength and hope by the intimation in the *gospel lesson*, that He shall rise again, which shall at last open up before their eyes the otherwise hidden glory, as a prelude of which the wayside beggar at Jericho from blindness saw and glorified God, and again by assuring us all *in the epistle*, that our life of fragmentary and ænigmatic knowledge shall be done away when that which is perfect has come, and we shall know even as we are known! While the Epiphany cycle sounds forth in swelling rapture the King of Glory, to join with its major chords the grand Easter anthem, with equal art and beauty does this Septuagesima transition breathe out its tender minor melody to join the sad but to us precious "Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi."

ART. VIII.—THE BIBLE IN COMMON SCHOOLS.

BY REV. D. GANS, D.D., NORRISTOWN, PA.

THE subject for the present season is, the Bible in the Common School. It has become a contagious theme. The School Council at Cincinnati, together with the deliverance of Henry Ward Beecher, in his thanksgiving sermon, has fully introduced it to the public mind of the country. Journals, secular and religious, all are alive with it, as if, at the present, at least, there could be nothing else of real importance.

The question is certainly one of deep and vital interest. Besides, this interest is individual as well as general, private, as well as public. The question is concrete and not abstract; and just here lies the trouble. If it were merely abstract, or something which the mind could determine upon in a purely theoretical way, separated from actual society, in the form of an outside floating theory, it would not be of such a disturbing and difficult nature. It is not, however, of the nature of Plato's ideal republic, formed for the clouds. It lies in our ordinary social life, which involves powers and forces affecting and conditioning the question which cannot easily be controlled either by individual thinking or willing.

That all education, to be true in itself, and accomplish the end at which it aims, must be Christian in its tone and character, there are few that are willing, now, to call in question. Man's nature demands this; and the true interests of society at large require it no less imperatively. We think that we may congratulate ourselves as a people, that this sense has come to be so general and earnest. It argues well for the culture already attained, and carries in it a promise for the future, which ought to be exceedingly encouraging to our hopes. This, as it strikes our mind, is the substantial part of the question;

nor do we see that, at this material point, there is much discrepancy between the Catholic and Protestant mind. Both alike believe, though in different senses, that the Christian faith is essential to true education, and should be made to enter, from the lowest rudiments to the highest elements of mental and moral training, the whole process of human enlargement in the form of education.

In its relation to Common Schools, the question becomes exceedingly complicated. The point for the present, in the most of journals, seems to turn upon the question: Shall the Bible be allowed a place in them? It requires but little reflection to see, that this does not answer the whole interest involved in the question. The mere presence of the Bible in the School does not make its education Christian. No one claims for the Bible power to produce any such magic effect. To condition the character of education, as we all know, the Bible, in connection with the divine and moulding life which it represents, must be made to enter the living process of education itself, and be made, in this way, a part of the pupil's thinking and feeling. Heretofore, and up to the present time, where the Bible has been allowed in the school, it has had no such prominence. Portions of it have only been read, but it has never been taught. It has never been made a positive text book, nor has it ever been placed upon an equality with any of the most ordinary branches of study. Never have its principles and doctrines been positively elaborated, as are those of mathematics, history and philosophy. And the reason is quite obvious. How could this be done in our present denominational division? Here is an absolute bar at once to the positive teaching of the Scriptures in the school, and yet, as we all say, positive teaching is essential to give a truly Christian tone to education. It is not difficult to see, that the main trouble in the way of using the Bible in the Common Schools arises just at this point. It is our denominational division that prevents the use of it in such a form as to make it of real Christian significance in education.

If now this be so, which must be the frank confession of each one, the question arises, Why should we be specially con-

cerned for the presence of the Bible at all in the school, if it cannot be there in such a way as to make the education positively Christian? What substantial object is there in requiring the presence of the Holy Scriptures, when we ourselves forbid their being taught in a positive, real way? The Bible certainly needs no mere vain compliment at our hands. It is designed for use in an actual and real way; and if we are not prepared to use it according to its own design, then, we cannot help asking, Why wish to use it at all? Would it not be as well to take Beecher's position at once, and give it up altogether, and, in this way, try to settle the perplexing Bible-question? This would look, at least, like consistency, however much of real infidelity it might involve—infidelity in the view of Catholic as well as true Protestant faith.

The trouble plainly, in this view of the case, lies with us Protestants. We want the Bible in the school, and yet do not want it there. We want it as a book, but do not want it in its positive teaching, in its educational sense and power, in its doctrine. Without this last, who is willing to fight for the first? Do we not here virtually give up the whole substantial question? And why do we do this? Is it not because of the divisions into which, as a Protestant world, we are organized? Ought we not frankly to confess our fault here, and plead guilty in the sight of God? The trouble lies not in the schools primarily, but in the Church, which, by its divided and conflicting condition, prevents the schools from attempting, at least, to teach Christianity in a positive way?

But, even suppose this difficulty to be out of the way, would the question then be relieved of all its perplexities? A very superficial reflection is sufficient to show us, that this would not be the case. Still would the question remain,—Should the State teach religion? No less unmanageable would be the difficulties environing this aspect of the general subject. There are few who would be willing to take the position, that the State is the proper agency to conduct the positive religious education of children. In what sense is it competent to teach theology? What parents, understanding the value of the

Bible in the educational development of the young, and having a proper sense of their responsibility in relation to the Christian education of their children, would be willing to have them taught religiously, in a positive way, in the Common School as it now stands? The State, as such, is not a Christian body at all, nor have the interests of Christianity ever been so committed to its keeping, as to make it either a competent or a safe teacher. This duty, clearly, as acknowledged on all hands, belongs to the family and the Church. The State could have no right to assume it; and if it should attempt to do this in an arbitrary way, and by authority, it is not difficult to see, that the troubles connected with the general subject would be increased a thousand fold. Education, to be true, must, as we all own, be positively Christian; but this positive Christian character is not to be given to it by the State.

Now, in the two facts above stated, we have briefly the elements that enter into and constitute what may be called the School problem; and it is these facts, which you cannot get rid of, that give it a peculiar complication and make it exceedingly difficult to solve. The first fact is, that the Bible, owing to the religious divisions of our society, *cannot* be positively taught in the school; and the second is, that, if it could, *the State, as such, would not be the proper agent to teach it.* These troublesome facts are not put into the question by the arbitrary will of those who are discussing it, and trying to bring it to some satisfactory solution; they are in it by its own intrinsic nature, and it is not possible to ignore them, or in any true way treat the subject as if they did not exist. If by the discussion, we could condition, mould or remove these facts, the way might soon be opened for clear sailing.

What may ultimately be made out of the general question for this country, in a practical way, remains yet to be seen. One thing, however, is becoming very clear, and it is this, that it will be exceedingly difficult to continue to keep the Bible in the school simply as a dead letter, as a sealed book, or as a dumb oracle. It will be impossible to generate and sustain sufficient zeal for the question under this unmeaning form, to

bear it forward long in a triumphant way; for the feeling is already wide-spread, that if the Bible cannot be used in the school in a more real way and with more positive Christian effect, than it now is, it might as well not be there at all. Such feeling as this is not opposition to the Bible, but to the absence of it—not to its real use in the Public Schools, but to its sham or pretended use.

No doubt, when the conditions of the question shall become fully understood, we shall all see that the main trouble lies, first, in the divided condition of the Church, and second, in the abstract separation of the Church from the State; for it is very clear, that, if it is the mission of the State to educate the children, and if that education, to be true, must be Christian, which the Church *only* can give, then there ought to be some real bond of union and co-operation between the State and the Church. If such union is not to be, then it follows, either that the education of the child, conducted by the State, must be wholly godless, or that the work of education does not belong to the State, and should be left in the hands entirely of the family, or given over in full to the Church. Some, in attempting to escape the perplexities of the problem, have chosen the last position, and would take the whole interest of education out of the hands of the State entirely. This, however, by many, is regarded as an extreme, involving a wrong against the State. The only other position that can be taken is, first, a union of the Church with itself, so as to open the way for a united positive teaching of the Bible, and second, such a union of the Church with the State as will enable the first to act in and with the last in the School.

To this extent we would give our voice decidedly in favor of the union of Church and State. The particular form of such union is not now a matter of inquiry. This can be a question of intelligent interest only when its essential condition is at hand, namely, the proper agreement among Christians themselves as expressed and symbolized in the true outward unity of the Christian Church.

Until some such result, in the good providence of God,

shall be brought about, it is clear, that the problem which now seems to be perplexing all minds, to a greater or less extent, view it in what light you may, will not be solved, and that in the meantime the Christian mind generally can have but little confidence in the enterprise of Common Schools, either with or without the Bible. The only intermediate safe-guard that can be thought of in the circumstances, is the Parochial School. Outside of this and the family, there is no room for positive Christian education. But this, with the money drained from Christian families for the support of the Common School, is exceedingly difficult to establish and sustain. No common sacrifices, however, or difficulties of any kind, ought to be allowed to keep Christian communities from the work which is here so imperatively demanded. Every large and able congregation should feel itself solemnly called to this work. We know of no other form, in which, now, and as long as facts shall stand as they do at present, the demands for real Christian education can be met and satisfied. We may fight and wrangle about having the Bible in the School in its present form, as long and as bitterly as we please, but this will bring us no real relief. We may depend upon it, that this problem itself is of a deeper nature than this. The question must be met at its radical points; and in the meantime, the Church must get to work in an actual way, and build up and sustain positive Christian schools, and thus show her faith by her deeds. Thus only, it is now entirely evident, can we intelligently hope to accomplish in a real way, what the vital interests of both Church and State alike imperatively demand.

ART. IX.—THE GENERAL SYNOD.

THE General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States which convened in Philadelphia, November 24th, 1869, continuing in session nine days, was the largest, and perhaps we may say the most important Synod, ever held by this denomination in this country. It was the largest, partly by reason of the growth of the Church since the last previous General Synod which met in 1866, and partly by reason of the remarkably punctual and full attendance of delegates from all portions of the Church. This full attendance was owing to the great interest taken in this meeting of the General Synod, because it was thought, that it would decide the policy of the Church in reference to certain important questions, which for some time had produced considerable agitation and warm discussion. Its importance consisted just in this fact, that its decisions had reference directly to certain practical questions very nearly concerning the continued integrity of the Church. The theological questions connected with the Liturgy were discussed at Dayton in 1866. The issue now confronting the Church related more to the practical policy to be pursued with reference to the differences that prevail on these questions. The *theological* battle was fought at Dayton; the practical issues that grew out of that battle were to be acted on in Philadelphia.

We may add yet, in this general way, that this Synod represented more fully the ability of the Reformed Church than any previous Synod, at least any of which we have any recollection. Each Classis selected its strongest men, so far as it could secure their services. All the educational centres were represented. Lancaster had the president of the college and two professors present, Mercersburg had the two professors of the Theological Seminary, Tiffin, the president of the college, and the professor

of theology, the Sheboygan theological and literary Institution had three of its professors present, the editors of the Church periodicals of Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and Cleveland, were there, and of pastors and elders throughout the Church, those who could ably represent her interests in every respect. Worthy of notice especially was the ability of the elders. There were men of tried, ripe piety, of great business experience, of sound judgment, and among them some of the best lawyers in the country.

Altogether, to the looker-on, the Synod presented a fine appearance, and transacted its business with marked ability and dignity. The proceedings were conducted in English and German. It was interesting to listen to the discussions, conducted now in the one language, now in the other. The German speeches were generally delivered with ease and fluency, and sometimes with real eloquence. German scholars excel as linguists. This was exhibited in the ease with which some of the German delegates could take up an English report, and, at first sight, translate it at once into the most excellent German.

Looking now beneath the surface, and considering the proceedings of the Synod, it may be asked, wherein consists their importance? To one unacquainted with the inner history of the liturgical question, there might seem to be nothing in the disposition made of that subject, for instance, which can be regarded as of any great importance. It would seem as though nothing were decided. The question is left pretty much as it stood before, a poor *settlement* of a question which has caused so much agitation, the mountain laboring, and a mouse brought forth. So it might seem in looking at the action from the outside merely. The importance of the action of Synod, however, on this as on some other subjects, consists rather in what the Synod refused to do, than in what it *did* do. An effort was made to secure action, which would result in damaging, if not destroying, the Order of Worship, and thus also turning back the whole liturgical movement in the Reformed Church. This was the order of attack. It came in Dr. Williard's amendment to the report of the committee on the Western Liturgy. This

amendment proposed to send the two liturgies down to the Classes for adoption or rejection, a course which, it was known, would in all probability result in the non-adoption of either. The friends of the Order of Worship wanted no legislation *for* it, but they were concerned that there should be no legislation *against* it. This was really the point at issue here. The opposition, it is true, fought at a great disadvantage. The two Western Synods had asked the General Synod to allow the use of the Western Liturgy; the report of the committee granted this request. How now could the delegates from the bounds of these two Synods vote against this report? It was difficult to see how even so many as 52 could do so, against 117 who voted for it.

Underneath this assault on the Order of Worship, there was also an attack upon the theological animus and life, that have been predominant in the Church, especially in the more populous Eastern section. It carried with it a blow aimed at our Eastern institutions, our Seminary and College, our publications, our order of Church life generally. Shall this Church life, which for years past has been directed away from the reigning Puritanism and Rationalism, towards the faith of the Creed, be turned back, now into the Puritanic and Rationalistic currents, or shall it be allowed to move on its accustomed course? This was the question to be met. The action against the amendment and in favor of the report, by so large a majority, was perhaps the most emphatic decision yet given against any change in the general direction of our Church life. We are not to turn back, but to go forward, even though we cannot, in doing so, fall in with what we regard as the rationalistic tendencies of Protestantism. In this view, what to merely outside observation seems to be no decision at all, is most positive and decided action.

At the same time it is entirely fair to the minority. They are placed on precisely the same footing with the majority. They may have and use their liturgy, and work in all proper ways to advance the theological life it represents. There is here certainly the full play of the Protestant principle of freedom. We could wish that Protestantism might give us a Church

that would decide with authority such issues, once for all, but this, it seems, cannot now be. The close relation into which the governing and the governed are brought in Protestantism, seems to require, that such issues be settled in the way of history, in which the governing power may not become arbitrary or tyrannical.

The General Synod thus has not allowed the liturgical question to pass out of its hands. It allows indeed all proper freedom, but it, nevertheless, holds in its hand the direction of the final issue. We regard the action taken on this subject as eminently wise and magnanimous, and calculated to allay strife and give comparative quiet to the Church. We say comparative quiet; for we cannot look for entire quiet so long as this solemn and important question is in process of settlement by a course of history. We do not at all deprecate such agitation as is necessary for the settlement of such subjects; it is better a thousand-fold than the quiet of stagnation.

Having seen, however, how far only the Church can go in the way of legislation, and what is to be wrought out, in the liturgical movement, in a practical way in the Church, we may say that we have at least settled the method according to which the question of the liturgy is to be finally settled. This is a great deal. We have no doubt the Church will finally settle down in the use of a liturgical order of worship. We believe this order will be substantially, though it may not be in all its particulars, according to the *Order of Worship*. Whether this will be the case, however, or not, we have faith that the Church will be guided to such conclusions as shall best promote the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom.

This liturgical question disposed of, it was generally felt, that another question of great importance was still pending, viz: that in regard to our Church government, as related directly to the character and powers of the General Synod. This subject had been brought before the attention of the Church previous to the meeting of the General Synod, by Dr. Nevin, in a series of somewhat startling articles in the Messenger. The action on this subject taken by the Eastern Synod at Danville also was calculated to direct very serious and general attention to the

matter. There was doubt in the minds of some, whether it would be best for the Church to continue the General Synod, or return to the form in which she maintained her existence previous to the formation of the General Synod, some six or eight years ago. Others, who had full faith in the policy of maintaining a General Synod, felt that it needs to be modified in order to work well for the Church. There was accordingly a general desire to meet and decide this question, at least in some of its preliminary points. At length the issue came: Shall we send down to the Classes the question of dissolving the General Synod, with a view to its reorganization in a modified form? The question was startling. It awakened a great deal of feeling. Many who differed on the liturgical question were of one mind here. They could see no valid reason for making the great risk of dissolving the Synod, and thus marring our unity, even though it looked towards a reorganization; might not an attempt at reorganization in this form now plunge us into greater difficulties, than those which seem to environ us in our present organization? Meanwhile the question was modified, proposing to send down to the Classes an overture to appoint delegates to a convention to reorganize our government. This was voted down by a small majority, many either being absent or not voting.

A motion was then made to commit the subject to a committee of *eleven* to revise the present constitution. This committee will continue the work of a committee appointed for the same purpose by the Synod at Dayton, but which (committee) was dissolved to make way for the appointment of this new and larger one. Whether this new committee now has members on it, who have the talent for this work, and whether the committee can bring in a constitution that will satisfy the Church at this time, remains to be seen. It is not every man's business to make constitutions. It requires a special order of talent that is very rare.

This action, it seems to us, shows, in the first place, that there is a desire and purpose to maintain our present organization in its essential features. We are to continue to have a General Synod. Whatever differences prevail among us, we believe that

we can settle them without disturbing our organic unity. But it shows also, that a modification of the General Synod, and perhaps also the District Synods, as to their character and powers, is desired. What that modification is to be particularly is not clear. We do not believe the General Synod itself would have been prepared to state it, or to give any definite instruction to the committee. Meanwhile we may hope that our necessities will reveal at least some modifications that may be needed.

A desire was expressed by a worthy German pastor, who ministers to the largest Reformed congregation in Philadelphia, that Synod should take some action, recommending that the leading festivals should be kept as *holy days*, that labor should be suspended on those days as on Sunday, and service be held in the Church. In many places, especially in cities and towns, these festivals are put off with an evening service only, and the day is spent in work. The object was to correct this evil. The Synod, accordingly passed a resolution, recommending the observance, especially of the five leading Church Festivals, Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost, and that so far as practical a *day-service* be held in the Churches on those days. This was passed unanimously.

These and similar questions which pertain more to the theoretical side of our Church life, and which necessarily are of first importance, having been thus put on the way towards a satisfactory settlement, the Synod now provided to enter with new vigor upon her practical work.

A new Board of Domestic Missions was elected, who are expected to press this important interest upon the attention of the Church, and carry it forward with increased and increasing vigor. The Board of Foreign Missions were instructed to seek out and establish a Foreign Mission, and meanwhile to aid the prosperous mission in India, which many of our German Churches are now supporting. Altogether we may expect new activity and increased prosperity throughout the Church, as a result of the late meeting of the General Synod in Philadelphia.

(Our limits do not allow us to present anything further on this subject.)

ART. X.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A LITURGY, OR ORDER OF WORSHIP *for the Reformed Church. Cincinnati: T. P. Bucher, Publisher,* 1869.

We congratulate our brethren of the Ohio and North West Synods upon the conclusion of their labors in getting out this Liturgy. It is designed to represent a somewhat different tendency of religious and theological life from that in the bosom of which rests the Order of Worship prepared by the old Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church. And yet it is such an advance on the views and feelings that formerly prevailed on this subject in the Western portion of the Reformed Church, that we are quite sure all the friends of the liturgical movement in the East will welcome its appearance. Its table of contents shows, that, consciously or unconsciously, it has come under the power of the liturgical spirit. Let the reader note these contents. 1. Calendar of the Festivals. 2. Table of Scripture Lessons for the Church Year. 3. Order of Service on the Lord's Day. 4. Prayers for the Regular Service on the Lord's Day. 1) Prayer before the Sermon, 2) Prayer after the Sermon. 5. Prayers and Canticles for the Festival Days, 1) Advent, 2) Christmas, 3) New Year, 4) Good Friday, 5) Easter, 6) Ascension, 7) Pentecost, 8) Trinity. 6. Prayers and Scriptural Lessons for Days of Public Prayer, Fastings, &c. 7 Prayers and Scripture Lessons for Days of Public Thanksgiving, Harvest Festivals, &c. 8. Prayers for special occasions. 9. Ancient Liturgical Forms. 10. Holy Baptism. 1) For Infants, 2) For Sick Children, 3) For Adults. 11. The Holy Communion. 1) The Preparatory service, 2) The Holy Supper, 3) The Communion of the Sick. 12. Confirmation. 13. Marriage. 14. Ordination and Installation of Ministers. 15. Ordination and Installation of Elders and Deacons. 16. Excommunication and Restoration. 17. The Laying of a Corner stone. 18. The Consecration of a Church. 19. The Opening and Close of Synods and Classes. 20. The Visitation of the Sick and Dying 21. Burial of the Dead. 22. Appendix, containing selections of Scripture Passages for special purposes, and a list of texts for the preacher.

This table of contents which we have here given at length, clearly shows that the book goes over the whole ground, and by the very force of liturgical laws becomes something more than a mere pulpit manual. We regard it as very far inferior to *The Order of Worship*, in all the elements that constitute a true liturgy; yet we would rejoice to see it come into general use in all the churches East or West, in which the Eastern liturgy is not used. If those who framed it, will take it to their hearts and urge it upon their people for use, we will have good hopes, that the Reformed Church will yet come to agreement on this vexed question.

We have not space here and now to point out what we regard as serious defects, as judged from its own standpoint. Only one we will refer to. In the consecration of the elements in the service for the Holy Communion, the words of institution are prefaced by a *reason* for their original utterance by our Saviour, which we think is much out of place. "To confirm our faith in this covenant of mercy, *our Lord Jesus Christ, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, &c.*" If the reason were correct, we would regard it as out of place in such a place, but whoever reads on will find, that other reasons are subsequently given in this same service, equally, if not more, important. For instance, "and that he feeds and nourishes your souls to everlasting life," &c.

But with all its faults, we welcome this liturgy. We hope it has been made in good faith and will be faithfully used. It ought to sell at a lower price, yet we do not regret our investment in it, which the agent made reasonable enough to us.

History of England; *from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude, M. A., Late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford Vols. I. II. New York: Charles Scribner & Company*, 1870.

From such examination as we have been able to give to these volumes, we find all true that has been favorably written in regard to style and the faithful industry, with which the author brings out many new facts in regard to this interesting period of English history. Of course there are two sides to that history. Catholic and Protestant differ widely in regard to the characters brought upon the stage. We would recommend the reading of both sides. The present work holds the attention of the reader, as it traverses an old field made new by the ability and industry of the author.

God's Furnace; *By one tried in the Fire. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 770 Broadway, cor. of 9th Street*, 1869.

An autobiography furnished by a lady whose name is not given, who believed she had a vocation to spend her life in prayer. It furnishes a variety of Christian experience, and breathes a pious, devotional spirit. It is published by the recommendation of J. H. McIlvaine, of Princeton.

The Divine Human in the Incarnate and Written Word; *and some Thoughts on the Atonement older than the Creeds. By a Member of the New York Bar. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company, 770 Broadway*, 1869.

A meaning title, but a poor volume of 200 pages hanging on to it. We may quote in regard to it the old proverb, "*Ne Sutor supra Crepidam.*" This member of the New York Bar, understands Blackstone, we would surmise, better than he understands theology.

When he says that "dogmatic theology is a dead lion," he should be sure beforehand that, in putting on himself the skin of that king of beasts, he be able to sound forth the true roar. The book shows a restiveness under the inadequate theories of Inspiration and the Atonement that prevail, but the writer gets hold of none better. He flounders in the mire of rationalism all through.

A COLLECTION OF THE PROVERBS OF ALL NATIONS. *Compared, explained, and illustrated. By Walter K. Kelly. Andover: Warren H. Draper, Main Street,* 1869.

The objection urged by Isaac Disraeli against collections of proverbs, on the ground of their "unreadableness," does not hold as regards this volume. Here the proverbs are not insulated, but "presented in orderly, coherent groups, and accompanied with appropriate accessories, so as to fit them for being considered with some continuity of thought." In any case, however, we do not regard the objection as of much weight. Proverbs are little *wholes*, each one of which can be studied in itself. There are few volumes which will more profitably occupy a leisure hour than this. Dean Trench, in his little work, "Proverbs and their Lessons," has opened the way for the study of such a volume as this.

It is gotten up in very handsome style, and would make an excellent gift book.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS. *By J. P. Lange, D.D., and the Rev. F. R. Fay. Translated from the German by J. F. Hurst, D.D., with Additions by P. Schaff, D.D., and the Rev. M. B. Riddle. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.,* 654 *Broadway,* 1869.

This is unquestionably one of the most valuable of all the volumes of Lange's famous Commentary of the Bible. The Epistle to the Romans as one of the most doctrinal of the New Testament epistles, necessarily brings out the doctrinal position of the Commentator. It is well that we have, on so difficult a portion of the New Testament, the rich and ripe thought and scholarship of Dr. Lange himself. As the first of the epistles also, it calls forth a valuable *Introduction*, first to all the epistles of St. Paul, and then to this particular epistle to the Romans. These occupy some *fifty* pages of the volume. Our limits will not allow us to point out in detail the leading positions presented, except to refer to the *fifth* chapter, where the parallel is drawn between the fall in Adam and the recovery and Salvation in Christ. The realistic view of the generic headship of the race is here maintained, over against all theories of merely outward, forensic, imputation. In this respect it follows in the same line of thought with the commentary of Dr. Forbes, who makes this parallelism between Adam and Christ to be the key to the interpretation of this epistle. The additions by the translators are many and valuable. Altogether we regard this as one of the richest of the volumes of this extensive Commentary of Dr. Lange, translated under the editorship of Dr. Schaff.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1870.

ART. I.—THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, AS CONFESSED BY THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, THETICALLY STATED, WITH THE EXEGETICAL ARGUMENT.

BY CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D.D.,

Norton Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

I. *Old Testament Foreshadows;* 1. *The Sacraments in Eden.*

In approaching one of the highest, if not the very highest, of the mysteries of our faith, it becomes us to prepare ourselves for a most earnest, patient, and candid investigation of the Scriptural grounds, on which that faith rests. The Lord's Supper has been looked at too much as if it were an isolated thing, with no antecedents, no pre-suppositions, no sequences; as if there were nothing before it, nothing after it, helping to determine its true character; while, in fact it links itself with the whole system of Revelation, with the most vital parts of the Old and New Testament, so that it cannot be torn from its true connections without logically bringing with it the

whole system. There is no process by which the doctrine of the Lutheran Church in regard to the Lord's Supper can be overthrown, which does not overthrow the entire fabric of the Atonement. No man can deem our distinctive doctrine of the Lord's Supper non-fundamental who thoroughly understands it in all its relations.

The first thing worthy of note in regard to the sacramental mystery is its antiquity. It meets us at the threshold of the divine history of our race. In Eden we see already the idea of natural and supernatural eating. We have there the natural eating terminating in the natural, in the words: "Of every tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat." Closely following upon this we have the idea of supernatural eating, with the natural bodily organ. "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Man did eat of it, and found it a sacrament of death. In, with, and under that food, as a divine means judicially appointed, was communicated death. That

> "mortal taste
> Brought death into the world and all our woe."

The great loss of Paradise Lost, was that of the Sacrament of Life, of that food, in, with, and under which was given immortality, so objectively, positively, and really that even fallen man would have been made deathless by it: "Now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever." Gen. iii. 22. The great gain of Paradise Regained is that of the Sacrament of Life. Christ says: "I am the life;" "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The cross of Christ is the tree of life, and He the precious fruit borne by heavenly grace upon it. The cross is the center of Paradise Regained, as the tree of life was the center of the first Paradise. Christ's body is the organ of the life purchased by His obedience and death. The Holy Supper is the sacrament of that body, and, through the body, the sacrament of the life which that body brings. But that same body is also a sacrament of death to the unworthy recip-

ient. The whole sacrament on its two sides of death and life is in it united: salvation to the believer, judgment to the unworthy. After the creation of man, God's first provision was for the generation and birth of the race, the foreshadowing of regeneration and of the new birth, for which, in Holy Baptism, the first provision is made in the new creation of the New Testament. The next provision made for man was that of sustenance for the life given, or yet to be given. In the Garden of Eden was a moral miniature of the universe; and with the act of eating were associated the two great realms of the natural and the supernatural; and with this was connected the idea of the one as a means of entering the other, of the natural as the means of entering into the supernatural. There were natural trees with purely natural properties, whose fruit was eaten naturally, and whose benefits were simply natural; bodily eating, terminating in a bodily sustenance. But there was also the natural terminating in the supernatural. There were two trees, striking their roots into the same soil, lifting their branches in the same air—natural trees—but bearing by Heaven's ordinance, in, with, and under their fruitage, supernatural properties. One was the sacramental tree of good. We call it a *sacramental* tree, because it did not merely symbolize life, or signify it; but, by God's appointment, so gave life—in, with, and under its fruit—that to receive its fruit was to receive life. The fruit which men there would have eaten was the communion of life. On Gen. iii. 22, the sound old Puritan commentator, Poole, thus paraphrases: "Lest he take also of the tree of life, as he did take of the tree of knowledge, and thereby profane that *sacrament of eternal life*."

With this tree of life was found the tree which was the sacrament of judgment and of death, and by man's relations to that tree would be tested whether he was good or evil, and by it he would continue to enjoy good or plunge himself into evil. By an eating, whose organs were natural, but whose relations were supernatural, man fell and died. This whole mystery of evil, these pains and sorrows which overwhelm the race, the past, the present, and the future of sin, revolve around a sin-

gle natural eating, forbidden by God, bringing the offender into the realm of the supernatural for judgment. We learn here what fearful grandeur may be associated in the moral government of God, with a thing in itself so simple as the act of eating. The first record of Revelation is an awful warning against the plausible superficiality of rationalism. It was the rationalistic insinuation of Satan, as to the meaning of God's Word, which led to the Fall. "Abandon faith in the letter of God's Word," said the Devil. Our first parents obeyed the seductive insinuation and died.

In the Lord's Supper three great ideas meet us as they met in Paradise. There is in it, 1, *Bread*, which, as bread, is the natural food of man, and belongs to all men. But there is also, 2, The supernatural element of *life:* "My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The natural bread, as the sacramental bearer of this heavenly food, is the communion of the body of Christ, that is, the medium by which the body is communicated or imparted. There is also in the Lord's Supper, 3, The supernatural element of *judgment*, and that of judgment unto death. "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or, judgment) unto himself, not discerning the Lord's body." The tree of life, as our theologians well observed, was not a memorial, a symbol, a suggestive emblem or sign; but was a supernatural, efficacious and energetic means of life. "This tree," says Osiander (1589), "by the divine ordination and will, bore fruit which could preserve the bodily vigor of him who partook of it ('in perpetual youth') until man, having completed the term of his earthly life, would, without dying, have been translated to his life in heaven." So also the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, did not symbolize a result, but brought it. *Life* was in, with, and under the fruit of the one tree; death, in, with, and under the fruit of the other.

This view is not a modern invention. It is found in Irenæus, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret. Gregory Nazianzen enlarges upon the idea of "being made immortal by coming to the tree of life." St. Augustine says, "In the other trees there was

nourishment; in this one, a sacrament ("*in isto autem Sacramentum*"). Vatablus, (1557), a very judicious Roman Catholic expositor, fairly expresses the general sense of the Fathers in stating his own. "The tree of life was a *sacrament*, by which God would have sealed immortal life to Adam, if he had not departed from His Commandment." Delitzsch: "The tree of life had the power of ever renewing and of gradually transfiguring the natural life of man. To have used it after the Fall would have been to perpetuate for ever the condition into which he had fallen."

Nor is the true view without support from sources whence we might least expect it. Rosenmuller (Rationalistic): "This writer means that the weakened powers were to be revived by eating of that tree, and this life was to be preserved forever." Knobel (strongly Rationalistic): "This passage (Gen. iii. 22) teaches that man after partaking of the tree of life would have become immortal." Dr. Bush, both in his earlier and later notes on Genesis (1833, 1852), says: "Adam might frequently have eaten (ed. 1852, "undoubtedly often ate") of the tree of life before the Fall—sacramentally as Christians eat of the Lord's Supper. In regard to the driving from Paradise 'lest he also eat of the tree of life and live forever,' Irenæus said: 'God has so ordered it that evil might not be immortal, and punishment might become love to man.'" Dr. Bush, who, had his judgment been in the ratio of his other endowments, would undisputably have taken the first rank among American commentators on the Old Testament, says, Gen. iii. 22, 23: "The language it must be acknowledged, seems to imply, that had man tasted of the tree of life, even after his rebellion, he would have lived forever, and that he was expelled from Paradise to prevent such a consequence." The conclusion, however, is so little in keeping with Dr. Bush's theology, that he undertakes to reason it away in a very feeble and rationalistic manner, in the face of what he concedes to be the obvious meaning of the passage.

2. *Flesh and Blood.*

Another hint toward the true view of the sacramental mystery is given us in the Divine declaration Gen. ix. 4: "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." Literally: "But flesh with its soul (*i. e.* life), its blood, ye shall not eat." Still more literally: "in its soul."

At the root of this prohibition lay a great typical idea which can be fully understood only in the light of the finished sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the light of His sacramental Supper, in which we participate in, or have communion with that sacrifice. The command was repeated again and again, and the reason most generally assigned was that the blood is the life of the flesh. But this reason seems itself to require an explanation, and this we find fully given in Leviticus, the book in which there is the amplest display of the typical element of sacrifice. In Lev. xvii. 10–14, we have a full explanation of the meaning of the reservation of the blood. It is especially the 11th verse in which the typical force of the prohibition is made manifest. Under the Old Testament they actually ate of the body of the sacrifice, but only drank a symbol of its blood. It was manifest that the reservation of the blood pointed to something yet to be accomplished, and hinted that the perfect communion in the whole sacrifice was reserved for another dispensation. Only in the light of this can we fully appreciate the startling character of our Lord's command, when for the first time in the history of the chosen race, He gave the command to drink that which He declared to be the blood of the New Covenant.

3. *The Supernatural and Natural Eating.*

When the three men, Gen. xviii., one of whom is called Jehovah, appeared to Abraham, the patriarch set before them bread, flesh, butter, and milk, and they did eat. Verse 8.

Here was the supernatural eating of the natural; the eating of natural food with the natural organ of an assumed body, and that body of course supernatural. These same three

heavenly persons did eat (Gen. xix. 3) of unleavened bread in the house of Lot.

Is there a greater mystery in the sacramental eating, in which the supernatural communicates itself by the natural, by the natural bread, to the natural mouth, than there is in this true eating, in which the supernatural partakes of the natural? If God can come down and partake of human food by human organs, so that it is affirmed of Jehovah that He did eat, He can lift the human to partake of what is divine by a process which though supernatural is yet most real.

4. *The Relations of Covenant to Sacrifice.*

The relations of sacrifice to covenant in the Old Testament suggest instructive parallels to the Lord's Supper. In Gen. xv. we have the covenant between God and Abraham sealed with sacrifice. In Gen. xxxi. 44, 46, is presented the idea of eating as an act of covenant. Laban said to Jacob: "Let us make a covenant," "and they did eat there upon the heap"; where eating is the crowning act of the covenant. But more than this is presented in this chapter, for in the particulars of the ratification of the covenant we are told (verse 54), "Then Jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread: and they did eat bread." Here is the idea, first, of sacrifice as the inseparable constituent in the covenant; then, of joint participation in the sacrifice by eating of it, by the parties partaking in the covenant through it.

5. *The Relations of Sacrifice to Sacrament.*

The idea of sacrifice under the Old Dispensation sheds light upon the nature of the Lord's Supper. "Without the shedding of blood is no remission." The slaying of the victim by shedding its blood, by which alone its death could be effected, was properly the sacrifice. After the sacrifice was made, two things were essential to securing its end: first, that God should receive it; second, that man should participate in it. The burning of the sacrifice by fire from heaven was the means of God's accepting it on the one side; and eating of it, the means

of man's participating on the other. The truth is, that the sacrifice of the Old Testament resolves itself into the very elements which we find in the Lord's Supper. The Altar was the Table of the Lord, and the whole conception of sacrifice runs out into this, that it is a covenanting Supper between God and man.

The sacrifice, through the portion burnt, is received of God by the element of fire; the portion reserved is partaken of by men, is communicated to them, and received by them. The eating of one portion of the sacrifice, by the offerer, is as real a part of the whole sacred act as the burning of the other part is. Man offers to God; this is sacrifice. God gives back to man; this is sacrament. The oblation or thing offered supplies both sacrifice and sacrament, but with this difference, that under the Old Dispensation God received part and man received part; but under the New, God receives all and gives back all: Jesus Christ in His own divine person making that complete which was narrowed under the Old Covenant by the necessary limitations of mere matter. But in both is this common idea, that all who receive or commune in the reception of the oblation, either on the one part as a sacrifice, or on the other as a sacrament, are in covenant; and in the light of this alone is it, that not on Calvary where the sacrifice was made, but in the Supper where the sacrifice is applied, the Saviour says: "This is the New Testament (the new covenant) in My blood."

6. *The Passover is a type of the Supper.*

The New Testament strikes its roots down into the very heart of the Old Dispensation, and to understand either we must study both together. Let us compare in the case of the paschal lamb and paschal supper, the type and the fulfilment, and we shall see how the earlier sheds light upon the later, and how both placed in their true relation illustrate each other. The following are but a part of the points of illustration, but they may be sufficient to lead the attentive student of God's Word to search for himself.

1. The passover was to be a *lamb*, and Christ is the true

Lamb. "They shall take to them every man a *lamb*," are the words of the institution of the passover.—Ex. xii. 3. The key to the typical reference of the lamb is already given in the words of Isaiah (liii.) "He" (the man of sorrows) "is brought as a *lamb* to the slaughter." But the New Testament unfolds the typical reference in all its clearness. "Behold the *Lamb* of God," (John i. 29, 36); "the blood of Christ, as of a *lamb*." 1 Pet. i. 12. It is by this name that Christ is revealed in the glories of the apocalyptic vision: "In the midst of the elders stood a *lamb*," "the elders fell down before the *lamb*": "Worthy is the *Lamb* that was slain." The title "lamb," is applied to our Lord between thirty and forty times in the New Testament.

2. The Paschal lamb was to be *typically perfect*, and Christ was *truly perfect*. The typical characteristics of the Paschal lamb it is not necessary here to dwell upon. It was to be perfect and unblemished in every respect to typify Him, who both in body and soul was spotless, "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." "Ye were redeemed . . . . with the precious blood of Christ, as of a *lamb without blemish and without spot*."—1 Pet. i. 12.

3. The Paschal lamb was to be *slain* as a type of redemption, and Christ was to be slain for the verity of redemption. "The whole assembly shall *kill* it." Ex. xii. 6. "Who *killed* the Lord Jesus." 1 Thes. ii. 15. "Lo, in the midst of the throne stood a Lamb as *it had been slain*. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou wast *slain*, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood. Worthy is the Lamb that was *slain*." Rev. v. 6–12.

4. The Passover was a typical sacrifice in the realm of the natural, and Christ is a true sacrifice in the realm of the supernatural. "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover." Exodus xii. 27. "Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed *for us*." Christ hath given Himself for us, an *offering* and *a sacrifice* to God. "When He said: Sacrifice and offering, and burnt offering, and offering for sin, Thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; *then* said He, Lo, I come to do

Thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second. By which will we are sanctified through *the offering of the body* of Jesus Christ once for all." Psalm xl. 6–8; Heb. x. 8–10. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works?" Heb. ix. 14.

5. The Paschal Supper was a typical, natural eating of the typical, natural lamb; the Lord's Supper is a true, supernatural eating of the true, supernatural Lamb. "And they shall *eat the flesh* in that night." Exod. xii. 8. "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh hath eternal life. He that eateth My flesh dwelleth in Me. My flesh is meat indeed." John vi. 51–56. "Thus shall ye eat it," said Jehovah. Exod. xii. 11. "Take, eat," said our Lord.

6. The Paschal Supper was a typical, natural *act;* the Lord's Supper is a true, supernatural *act.* "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord—he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or judgment) to himself, NOT DISCERNING THE LORD'S BODY!"—1 Cor. x. 16; xi.

7. The Paschal Supper was a *natural communion* of the type; the Lord's Supper is a *supernatural communion* of the *substance.*

8. The Paschal Supper was a feast by which the typical was presented in, with, and under the natural; the Lord's Supper is a feast by which the *true* is presented in, with, and under the natural.

9. In the Paschal Supper the body of the typical lamb was received, together with the bread, after a natural manner; in the Lord's Supper the body of the true Lamb is received, together with the bread, after a supernatural manner.

10. The natural eating of the typical Paschal lamb belongs to the sphere of lower reality—that is, of mere earthly and carnal fact; the supernatural eating of the true Paschal Lamb belongs to the sphere of higher reality—that is, of heavenly and spiritual truth.

Thus does the dim twilight of the dawning Old Testament, if rightly used, open to us a purer vision of truth than unwilling eyes can find in the sunlight of the New Testament. How does the parallel run out into the minutest particulars between these representative institutions of the two great dispensations!

11. Of the Paschal festival, Jehovah said: "This day shall be unto you for a memorial;" of the Lord's Supper, the incarnate Jehovah said: "This do in remembrance of Me." Luke xxii. 19.

12. "The blood shall be to you for a token," says Jehovah. "This is My blood of the New Testament"—"the communion of the blood of Christ"—"is guilty . . . of the blood of the Lord."

13. "When I see the blood I will pass over you, and the plague shall not rest upon you," says Jehovah. "This is My blood," says our Lord, "shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

14. "Ye shall keep it a feast," says Jehovah. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast," 1 Cor. v. 8, or as Luther, bringing out still more clearly this element in the words, renders them: "We also have a paschal lamb, that is Christ, offered for us, wherefore let us keep passover." (*Oster-lamm, Ostern.*)

15. Ye shall keep it to the Lord . . throughout your generations."—"Ye do show the Lord's death till He come." 1 Cor. xi. 26.

16. "The man that . . forbeareth to keep the passover, even the same soul shall be cut off from among his people." "Except ye *eat the flesh* of the Son of man, *and drink* His blood, *ye have no life in you.*" "Whosoever eateth *leavened* bread, that soul shall be cut off from Israel." "He that eateth and drinketh *unworthily*, eateth and drinketh *damna-*

tion [*or judgment*] to himself, not *discerning the Lord's body*. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." 1 Cor. xi. 29, 30.

17. Strike the lintel . . with the blood." "This is My blood which is shed for many." "Ye are come to the blood of sprinkling,"—"elect . . through sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

18. "In one house shall it be eaten." "Having an high priest over the house of God"—"Christ whose house are we." "Ye come into one place." "The members of that one body, being many, are one body." "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread."

19. "*Thou* shalt not *carry* forth aught of the flesh *abroad* out of the house." Ex. xii. 46. "We have *an altar* whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." Heb. xiii. 10.

20. "When a stranger shall sojourn with thee and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it." Exod. xii. 48. "For by one Spirit are we *all baptized into one body*, whether we be *Jews or Gentiles*, whether we be bond or free; and have been *all* made to *drink into one* Spirit." 1 Cor. xii. 13.

21. "*One law* shall be to him that is *home-born*, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you." Exod. xii. 49. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

22. "All the congregation of Israel shall keep it," (Hebrew: do it.) Exod. xii. 48. "Drink ye all of this; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me." Matt. xxvi. 27, 1 Cor. xi. 25.

Origen cont. Celsum VIII: "Christ our passover is slain and this feast is to be kept, by eating the flesh of the Logos." "ὅτι το πασχα ημων εθυθη χριστος και χρη εορταζειν εσθιοντα

της σαρκος του λογου." Beza on 1 Cor. v. 7: "Our whole life should be in conformity with Christ, that feast of unleavened bread, in which we were made partakers of that spotless Lamb who was slain." Grotius: "As by the blood of the Paschal lamb, the Israelites were delivered from destruction, so also Christians, by the blood of Christ are liberated from the common ruin of mankind. That lamb was to be without fault, and Christ was without fault. (See Luke xxii. 16). Christ therefore is the mystic passover, that is the Paschal Lamb." On 1 Cor. v. 7.

Amid all these transitions from type to fulfilment the change is never from the more true to the less true, nor from the real to the ideal, but there is either a coincidence in the natural with an elevated use in the New Dispensation, or a higher natural with a true supernatural attached to it. There is in both, for example, a coincidence in a *real shedding* of blood, though in the shedding of Christ's blood there is a supernatural efficacy; there is in both a *real eating*, but in the one the communion effected is earthly, in the other it is heavenly. This then is the point to which these great Biblical truths irresistibly lead us, that CHRIST IS THE TRUE PASCHAL LAMB, AND THE SUPPER OF CHRIST IS THE TRUE PASCHAL SUPPER. What the paschal lamb of the Old Dispensation typified, Christ is; and what the paschal supper of the Old Dispensation typified, the supper of Christ is; and that which is promised and shadowed in the paschal supper is given in the Lord's supper, in very deed and substance. The supernatural presence of Christ's body and blood cannot be less true, but is more true, than the natural presence of the body and blood of the paschal lamb.

That the true relation between the two paschal lambs, and the two paschal suppers, should be most clear, it pleased God that there should be a coincidence in point of time between the ending of the shadow and the full appearing of the substance. The Sun of Revelation stood at its perfect zenith, and the shadow was cast no longer by the substance, because the shadow lay beneath Christ's feet. The sun stands henceforth, at its noontide, and we are done with shadows forever. Therefore it was written in

God's purposes that the true paschal Lamb should be slain at the feast of the old Passover. Our blessed Lord dwelt upon the time as in itself an essential element of the perfectness of His work: "With desire have I desired to eat *this* Passover with you before I suffer," (Luke xxii. 15): "Before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knew that His hour was come." John xiii. 1.

It was at the Passover time, in a Passover family group of disciples, in a room prepared for the Passover, that the Lord's Supper was instituted. The bread which our Lord brake, was bread provided for the Passover. The cup which He blessed was filled with wine prepared for the Passover. It is a new Paschal Supper. But where is the *slain lamb* of this new Paschal? Where is that *verity* in it of which the unspotted lamb of the first paschal is the type? Where is that shed blood of which the shed blood of the first paschal is the type? Is it to be characteristic of the New Testament Paschal Supper that it shall have *no paschal lamb;* that there shall *be bread and wine*, but that the great element of the *soul's nourishment*, the *lamb itself*, of which these were but the accompaniments, and as *attendants* of *which* alone they were given, that the *lamb* shall be wanting? "Christ our *Passover*, *our Paschal Lamb*, *is slain for us;* therefore let us keep the feast." 1 Cor. v. 8. To feed upon the paschal lamb is the *grand object of the feast*, *and if the Lord's Supper be but the taking of bread and wine*, *the true paschal lamb not being truly present*, *and not truly received*, then is the substance more shadowy than the shadow, and the Christian at his Supper, has less than the Jew at his Passover. Well might a child-like faith breathe a sigh, as it were an echo of the innocent words of Isaac: "My father: behold the fire and the wood; but WHERE IS THE LAMB?"—but a faith like that of Abraham, in the light of a new dispensation, will answer: "My son, God has provided Himself a lamb."

7. *The Manna in the Desert.*

"They said one to another: It is manna. (*Sept.:* What is this? *Ti esti touto.*) And Moses said unto them, This is the

bread (*Sept.: outos o artos,*) which the Lord hath given you to eat. This is the thing (*Sept.: Touto to rema,*) which the Lord hath commanded." Exod. xvi. 15. "I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread (*outos estin o artos*) which cometh down from heaven, that he that eateth of it may not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." John vi. 49–57. "All (our fathers) did eat the same spiritual meat." 1 Cor. x. 3. *Cyrill* (*Lib.* iv. *in Joh.* xvi.): "The manna was not therefore the living food, but the sacred body of Christ is the food which nourisheth to eternal life." *Lombard* (*Lib.* iv. *Sentent.*): "That bodily bread brought the ancient people to the land of promise through the desert; this heavenly food will carry the faithful, passing through the desert, to heaven." *Gerhard, John* (*Loci* xxii. *ch.* ii.): "By that bread which came down from heaven, that is by Christ's body, we are nourished, that we perish not with hunger in the desert of this world."

In quoting the sixth chapter of John, as bearing on the Lord's Supper, it may be well, once for all, to say that it is quoted not on the supposition that it speaks of the Lord's Supper specifically, but that in stating the general doctrine of the life-giving power of Christ's flesh and blood, it states a doctrine under which the benefits of the sacramental eating come as a species. If we come into supernatural, blessed participation of Christ's flesh and blood, in the act of faith, without the Lord's Supper, *a fortiori*, we have blessed participation of them in the act of faith with the Lord's Supper. The sixth of John treats of the grand end of which the Lord's Supper is the grand means. We partake of Christ's body and blood sacramentally, in order that we may partake of them savingly. Of the latter, not of the former, the sixth of John speaks.

II. *The New Testament Doctrine of the Lord's Supper Thetically Stated.*

The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as the Lutheran Church

believes it to be set forth in the New Testament, is thus defined in her great general Symbol, The Augsburg Confession:

Of the holy Supper of our Lord, our Churches, with one consent, teach and hold;

1. That the *true* body and blood of Christ are the sacramental objects.

2. That the sacramental objects are *truly* present in the Lord's Supper.

3. That this true presence is under the form or species of *bread and wine.*

4. That present, under this form or species, they are *communicated.*

5. That thus communicated, they are *received by all Communicants.*

6. That the opposite doctrine is to be rejected.

On each and all of these we affirm that the doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church is the Scriptural doctrine.

1. *The Sacramental Objects.*—We affirm then that it is a Scriptural doctrine; That the true body and blood of Christ are the sacramental objects; that is, that apart from any questions on other points, the true body and true blood of our Lord, are the objects set before us in the sacramental words, and whether their presence be offered to contemplation, to memory, to faith, or after a substantial, supernatural manner, it is the true body and true blood of Christ, of which we are to make our affirmation, or denial, when we state the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

By *true* body, we mean that body in which our Saviour was actually incarnate, as opposed to His mystical body, which is the Church, or any ideal or imaginary body. It is conceded that it was His true body, not His mystical body, which was given for us; but Christ, in the Lord's Supper, says: "This is My body, *which is given for you:*" therefore the sacramental object is His true body. As neither His mystical body, nor the Holy Spirit dwelling in His body, nor a sign nor symbol of His body, nor a memorial of His body, nor faith in His body, was given for us, but His true body itself was given, it and it alone,

and neither one nor other of all the objects substituted for it, is the first sacramental object.

2. By His true blood, we mean that blood which was the actual seat of His human vitality, that "precious blood" wherewith we are bought. It was confessedly His true blood which was shed for the remission of sins; but Christ, in the Lord's Supper, says: "This is My blood, *which is shed* for the remission of sins." Now, as neither a doctrine about His blood, nor the efficacy of His blood, nor the Holy Spirit uniting us with His blood, nor a sign, symbol, nor memorial of His blood, nor faith in His blood was shed for sins, and as His true blood alone was so shed, it, and none other of all the objects substituted for it, is the second sacramental object.

Corollary a.—Hence the objection is groundless that our Confession adds to Scripture by saying that Christ's *true* body is the sacramental object, for although that adjective *true*, is not used in the words of the institution, the idea is there, if the body which was broken for us is Christ's true body, and His blood shed for us is true blood. Calvin, and even Zwingle were compelled to concede so much.

Corollary b.—Hence also falls to the ground the charge of conflicting representations, when our theologians speak sometimes of the *natural* body, and sometimes of the *glorified* body of Christ as present. Christ's *true* body, His *natural* body, and His *glorified* body, are one and the same body in identity. The words *true* and *natural*, refer to its *essence;* the word *glorified* refers to its *condition.* The *glorification* of His body neither made it cease to be *true* nor *natural.* That is, it was no more an unreal, ideal, or imaginary body, after the glorification than before. It was identically the same body, but with a constant and plenary exercise of glorious properties. What He possessed, but did not ordinarily use in the days of His humiliation, He now constantly and fully exercises, and this new condition is called His glorification. Though His natural and true body is present, its condition is glorified. But though its condition is glorified, it is not in virtue of that glorification but because of, and through its union as one person with God,

that it is present. This presence is *spiritual*, when that word is opposed to carnal, but it is not spiritual, when that word is opposed to true, as if His presence were something wrought by our spirits. His body is a spiritual body, as opposed to the present conditions and limitations of flesh and blood, but it is not spiritual as opposed to real and natural. All the pretended contradictions of our theology vanish when the terms of that theology are taken in the sense in which it uses them.

II. *The True Presence.*

We affirm it to be a Scriptural doctrine that these sacramental objects, to-wit: the true body and true blood of Jesus Christ, are *truly present* in the Lord's Supper: *Vere adsint—wahrhaftiglich gegenwartig sei.*

We oppose a true presence, first, to the Zwinglian theory, that the presence of these objects is simply ideal, a presence to our memory or contemplation: secondly to the theory set forth by Bucer in the Tetrapolitan Confession, further elaborated by Calvin, and now generally known as the Calvinistic, to-wit; that the body and blood, are present in efficacy through the working of the Holy Spirit, in the believing elect. In opposition to the first, we affirm it to be Scriptural, that the presence is one wrought not by our ideas, memories, or contemplation, but is a presence equally true, whether we do or do not think, remember, contemplate, or believe. In opposition to the second, we affirm, that the efficacy of Christ's body and blood is not separable from them, but is wrought by them truly present; that this efficacy is direct and personal, not mediated by the Holy Ghost, but by Christ Himself, substantially present; that this presence does not depend for its reality (but alone for its salutary results) upon the faith of the receiver, and that its sole causes are the divine personality, and beneficent will of the Institutor of the Supper. We prove this, first, by the demands of all those types of the old Testament which contemplate Christ as the Paschal Lamb, who is to be present in that nature in which He was slain, not after the shadowy mode of the old dispensation, but after the true mode of the

new, in the New Testament Paschal. It is through His human nature that Christ is our Paschal Lamb sacrificed; and, therefore, it must be through His human nature that Christ our Paschal Lamb, is eaten. If it was not through His Divinity, separate from His humanity, that He was sacrificed upon the Cross, it cannot be that through His divine nature, separate from His humanity, He is given to us at His table. We prove it, secondly, by the demands of the type, of Old Testament sacrifices, which were not only to be offered to God, but to be partaken of by the priests and offerers. That body and blood which were offered to the Father, and by Him accepted, must also be partaken of by those for whom they were offered, and the partaking must be a *true* one, as the offering itself was true—but in order to a true partaking, there must be a true presence.

Thirdly: The words of the institution force us to this conclusion. For if it even be granted for a moment, for argument's sake, that these words might be taken symbolically, the symbol only postpones, by one process, the general result. but by no means sets it aside. A symbol must be the symbol of some real thing; and there must be a point of analogy to constitute a symbol; a sign must point to the reality of which it is the sign; a symbolical act pre-supposes a real corresponding act; and something symbolically done to a symbol implies that something, to which that is analogous is to be, or ought to be really done to a real object. Why, then, is *bread* the symbol of Christ's *body*—not, (as we have already shown), the symbol of a doctrine about that body, or of its efficacy, but of the *body* itself? What is the point of analogy? It must be that both are food. Then Christ's body must be conceded to be true food, or bread cannot be the symbol of it. But if Christ's true body be conceded to be true food, then the symbol has brought us to the acknowledgment of a true presence somewhere—but if there be a true presence anywhere, it will not be denied that it is in the Lord's Supper. Furthermore if bread be the symbol of a true body, breaking bread the symbol of a true breaking of a true body, then the eating of that bread must be the symbol of a true eating of atrue body;

but if it be granted that this takes place anywhere, it will not be denied that it takes place in the Lord's Supper. Thus is the theory of the symbol really subversive of itself, unless it be contended that we eat symbolically in the Supper what we eat truly elsewhere, which no one is likely to maintain. The parallelism may be made more obvious by presenting it in a tabular view:

SYMBOL.	REALITY.
1. Bread.	1. True Body.
2. Breaking of Bread.	2. True Breaking of True Body.
3. Eating of Broken Bread.	3. True Eating of True Body truly Broken.
4. Cup, (Contents.)	4. True Blood.
5. Pouring Out.	5. True Blood, truly shed.
6. Drinking.	6. True Drinking of True Blood, truly shed.

But it is impossible, on sound principles of interpretation, to find a symbol in the words of the Institution. The Eucharist combines three characters which forbid such an idea. 1. It is a *Supper*. 2. It is *Testamentary*. 3. It is a *Covenanting Rite*.

1. When at a *Supper* a guest has offered to him anything, with the request to eat, and with assignment of the reason: This is so and so—all laws of language lead us to expect that the thing so offered, shall be, not the sign, symbol, or memorial of that which is to be eaten, but shall be the very thing designated. If the words of the Institution had been: "Jesus said, Take, eat, This is *bread*," would not the man be thought to trifle who would urge that He gave them, not bread, but a sign, symbol, or memorial of bread? Would he help himself by appealing to interpretations of dreams, to parables, metaphors, figures and symbols? By no means. Men would ask him for an instance in which at a *Supper*, any one had said: "Take, eat, This is bread," meaning that it was not bread, but a symbol of bread. Who would say, seriously, at a Supper, handing a man a book: "Take, eat, This is sponge cake," meaning

that as a sponge cake is light and pleasant to the body, so is the book of which it is a symbol, a light work, and pleasant to the mind? Why is it that the Supper of our Lord stands separate in the world in this, that in it alone, in any sense, symbolical or sacramental, imaginary or real, the guests are invited to participate in the body of Him of whom it is the memorial? Does not this fact alone demonstrate that Christ's body is solitary in its powers and relations to men; that language in regard to it belongs to a wholly different sphere from that which pertains to the bodies of other men; that we can affirm of it what would be worse than blasphemy, what would be incoherent raving if made in regard to any but Christ? Would any man at a supper, devoted to the memory of Washington, offer bread, and say: "Take, eat, This is Washington's body?" Would he use such language at all, or if he did, could he mean thereby that the spirit of Washington, or his principles, or the efficacy of the work he had wrought through his body, are the support of our civil life, as bread supports the natural life? These suppositions look so monstrous that we can hardly think of them gravely as they really are, that is as actual parallels to the mode of interpretation substituted for that of our Church, by men who pronounce our doctrine unscriptural. It is not overstating the fact to declare that as a question of the laws of language, apart from philosophical speculation or doctrinal system, the meaning of the words: "Take, eat, This is My body," are as clear as any passage from Genesis to Revelation. Dr. Hodge says that the words have been the subject of an immense amount of controversy, but so have been the clear words which teach the Trinity, the Divinity of our Lord, the eternity of future punishments; not that they are not clear, but that men will not admit them in their obvious sense. A doctrine is not proved to be disputable, simply because it is disputed.

Finally, to put this point in a just light, suppose that our Lord at the Supper, had said: "Take, eat, This is bread," and that men had arisen, who, in the face of this clear testimony, had said it was not bread of which He spoke, but His body and His body only, how would the patrons of the Zwinglian

theory, which in that case would have been related to the words supposed, as the Lutheran view now is, to the words used, how would they have received such an interpretation? They would have received it with astonishment and reprobation, just as their own interpretation deserves to be regarded, when our Lord Jesus, stating what is that very thing for the reception of which the Supper was instituted, says: "Take, eat, this is My *body*." If our Master's words would have been clear according to the laws of language, in the terms we have for illustration's sake, supposed Him to have used, then equally clear, according to the same laws, are the words which He did use. He who believes that the words *supposed* would have proved that our Lord desired to communicate to His disciples *bread*, must believe, if he is consistent, that the words He actually *used* prove that He desired to communicate to them His *body*. If he objects to the latter inference, then his objection is derived not from the laws of language, but from philosophical or rationalistic principles, which he is determined, shall override the clear word. Hence, we repeat the thought, and close this part of the argument with it, that the meaning of the terms of the Institution, as a pure question of language, is as clear as the meaning of any part of the Word of God—and that meaning is the one which our Church accepts and confesses. If the absolute authority of God's word stands, the sacramental doctrine of our Church stands, for if it be incontrovertible that it is unsound to interpret, "This is bread," as meaning, "This is *not* bread, but is My body only," it is equally incontrovertible, that it is unsound to interpret, "This is My body," as meaning, "This is not My body, but bread only."

2. The words of the Eucharist are also Testamentary—they are the *Words of the Will* of our Lord who is about to die, and who invests His heirs with that whose possession gave them all that He desired to secure to them. But who ever heard of *a will* which bequeathed signs or symbols—not real possessions to the heirs? If a will were produced in which the Testator had said: It is my wish and will that M. N. should have such and such a tract of land and so many thousand dollars; and when M. N.

came to claim land and money, he was told that this "tract of land" was a sign or symbol of the Heavenly Canaan, which is the home of the soul as an earthly tract of land may be the residence of the body; and that the thousands of dollars were simply a sign of incorruptible treasures in the other world; and that the testator meant only that it was his wish and will that M N. should have these good things of the other world, would he consider this sound interpretation? When Christ gives us Himself, He gives us everything. His body and blood are the organs of His Deity. In giving them to us He gives all to us; but in giving to us the mere signs of them, He would give us very little. All bread is as such equally a symbol of His body; all wine is a symbol of His blood. Give us but these symbols at His Testamentary Supper, and we have at the Lord's Supper only what we may have at every meal. What we want is Christ Himself, not symbols of Him.

But were the case less clear in regard to the Testamentary words, were it possible with equal propriety to embrace a strict or a loose acceptation of them, still the law holds good, that where a dispute arises in which it is impossible to settle which one of two meanings is the correct one, the preference shall be given to the more literal of the two; and this rule is good here. If we run the risk of erring, let it be by believing our Lord too far, too closely, too confidingly, rather than by doubting or by trying to explain away the natural import of His words.

3. The Lord's Supper is a Covenanting Institution. But in a Covenant as in a Testament, the things mutually conveyed and received are not the signs nor symbols of things, but things themselves. Whenever, as in the case of a will, disputes arise as to a literal or a laxer meaning, that interpretation, other things being equal, is always safest which adheres most closely to the very letter of the terms.

But the character of the covenanting words is yet further settled by their obvious allusion to the terms of the Old Covenant. "Moses took the blood of calves and of goats, and sprinkled both the books and all the people, saying: This is the blood of the Testament which God hath appointed unto you."

It is with these words in His mind our Lord says: "This is *My* blood (not the blood of calves and of goats) of the *New* Testament," (not of the Old.) Surely if in the forming of the Old Covenant, which is a covenant of shadows, types and symbols, there was true blood, not the sign or symbol of blood, much more in the forming of the New Covenant, which is one of body, substance, and reality, we have not the symbol of blood, but the true blood of the great sacrifice.

4. Let us now look for a moment at the words of the Institution singly. "Take, eat; this is My body given for you." The Lutheran Church confesses that each word in this sentence is to be understood literally. The taking is a true taking, the eating a true eating. "This" means this—this which I tell you to take, this which I tell you to eat, this is, truly is, "My body," My true body truly given for My disciples. How have those who favored a symbolical interpretation evaded the natural force of these words?

Against a sense so natural, so direct, so universally received by the Holy Church of all ages, in its great assertion of an objective presence of Christ's body and blood, its opponents were bound to produce, not merely as probable a sense, but one more probable. They were bound in undertaking to shake the faith of Christendom, to produce an interpretation capable of a clear statement, and of invincible proofs. They were morally bound to have some agreement as to what was to be substituted for the received interpretation, and by what principles its necessity was to be demonstrated from God's word. This they have attempted for nearly three centuries and a half, and up to this hour the failure has been total in every respect. They are as far as ever from a fixed sense of the words, or a principle by which the sense can ever be fixed. There is no position midway between the implicit acceptance of the literal sense, and the chaos of eternal doubt.

The first view which was arrayed against that of our church was the view of Carlstadt. He admitted the literal force of every term in the Institution, and interpreted thus: The Saviour said, Take, eat, and came to a full pause. Then pointing

with His finger to His body, He uttered as a distinct proposition, "This body is My body." It is hardly necessary to add that so preposterous an interpretation found few friends.

The word TAKE these interpreters have usually construed literally, though why an imaginary body or the symbol of a body might not be taken mentally, they cannot say. Men do not open doors, because a door is a symbol of Christ: why should they take and eat bread because it is a symbol of His body? A symbol is addressed to the mind; it derives its being and takes its shape from the mind of the user, and is intellectually received by the person to whom it is addressed. The mere symbol cannot be so identified with its object, as that an inference from the object is logically applicable to the symbol, or from the symbol, logically applicable to the object. We cannot say of one door more than another, "That door is Christ," but still less could we draw an inference from the symbol to the object, or from the object to the symbol.

The symbolic theory, even were we to grant its assumption, can give no intelligible reason for the statement, "*This* bread is My body. *This* cup is My blood," for as a symbol, This bread is no more Christ's body than any other bread; as one lamb, one vine, or one shepherd, is no more a symbol of Christ than another. The symbol is founded on the common quality of the thing symbolizing; the innocence of all lambs, the nutritious character of all bread, the means of access furnished by every door. It is evident that as it is only after Christ blessing the bread, that it is true that "This," which He now commands us to "Take, eat," is His body—and that this bread was just as much a symbol of His body before the blessing as after it, was and is, just as much a symbol out of the sacrament as in it—that the "this" cannot refer to the bread merely, nor can the bread in the Supper, be no more than a symbol. There is true body and true bread, so related that the true bread is the medium of the sacramental communion of the true body, and for this reason only could it be true, that "*this*" bread, more than any other, could be called the body of our Lord.

The word EAT they have interpreted literally, though why the eating ought not to be done symbolically or mentally, to correspond with the symbolical or mental character of the body, they cannot say. Certainly there are plenty of instances of a figurative use of the word "Eat," while there are none of such a use of the word "is." The Quakers are more consistent.

The word "THIS," they have interpreted variously. The renowned Schwenckfeld gets at its meaning by reading the Saviour's words backwards thus: My body is this, that is, My body is bread—nourishes the soul as real bread nourishes the body. That is he makes the subject "this," the predicate; and the predicate "My body," the subject. Those who have entered the lists against the doctrine of our Church, usually insist that "this" qualifies "bread," that is, that the pronoun touto, which is neuter, qualifies the noun which is masculine. Determined to be fettered by no laws of language, they abrogate the rule—that a pronoun shall agree with the noun it qualifies in gender.

Some theologians who have attacked the faith of our church, have, in order to make their work easy, been pleased to invent arguments and positions for her. They have, of course, been able to do with their imaginary arguments for her what they could not do with her real arguments for herself. They have found that upsetting the men of straw, of their own making, was very different from uprooting the everlasting foundations of the temple reared by God.

One of these weak inventions is, that our church adopts this ungrammatical construction of a neuter pronoun with a masculine noun, and that hence she after all deserts the literal sense of the word, and that her interpretation really is: "This (bread) is *not* My body, but *in*, *with*, and *under* it My body is given." But as the church does not consider the neuter pronoun as qualifying the masculine noun, and does not interpolate the word bread, but takes our Lord's words precisely as He utters them, all this ingenuity is thrown away. It only shows how she might have argued, had she possessed as little grammar, as little logic, and as little reverence for her Master's

words as is exhibited by such antagonists. From the words: "This is My body," she only gathers this: "This is Christ's body;" and neither on the one hand that the bread is not His body, nor on the other that His body is given in, with, and under it. She acknowledges that the *ecclesiastical* (not Biblical) phrase "*This* bread is Christ's body," sets forth a truth, as the Church uses and understands it; and from a comparison of text with text, she knows that the bread is the medium by which, in which, with which, under which the body is imparted, but she reaches this by no reading out of the text what is in it, nor reading into it, what is no part of it; but by interpreting every word, in that natural and proper sense, which is fixed by the laws of language. Our Saviour says, Take, and we take; He says, Eat, and we eat; He says: This (which He has just told us to take, eat) is My body, and we believe it. The affirmation is as literal as the command, and we believe the one as we obey the other, to the letter, no more understanding His affirmation to be, This is *not* My body, than we understand His command to be, Do *not* take, Do *not* eat.

"*My body*," some have interpreted to mean "symbol of My body," but as this would make the Saviour say that "the symbol of His body" not His body itself, was given for us, the symbol of His blood not His blood itself was shed for us, this view is generally abandoned. It was the view of Œcolampadius, the Melancthon of Zwingle in the Swiss Reformation, but far greater than his master. He was too good a scholar to be ignorant that the metaphor, if there be one, must lie in one of the nouns connected, and not in the substantive verb which connects them. As the bread was indubitably literal bread, he saw that he must either make "body" metaphorical, or abandon the idea of metaphor. The later divines of this general school rejected this theory with an earnestness which shows that they were ashamed of it. Thus Beza:* "The words which follow, to wit, 'which is given for you' and 'which is shed for you,' compel us to understand the words of the very substance

* Epis. 5, ad Alaman. III. 202, and Adv. Illyricum, 217.

itself of the body and blood of Christ." "We do not doubt that by the term body is meant that very body which was assumed for our sakes and crucified." This view of Beza, was indeed the view of the whole body of Calvinistic theologians, with few and inconsiderable exceptions. The sole refuge left, therefore, for the disputer of the doctrine of our Church, is in the word "IS." The word "is," Zwingle * and those who follow him, say means "represents, is a symbol of." Hence they draw the inference that our Saviour means: "This [bread] [represents, is a symbol of] My body." Because then it is to be a symbol of His broken body, He breaks this bread, and because it is to be a symbol of His body given, He gives this bread, and because it is to be a symbol of His body taken, they take this bread—and what then?—because it is to be a symbol of His body eaten, they eat this bread. The symbol does not help its friends very far nor very long.

We have shown, that the laws of language forbid the application of the symbol here, even if the words in the abstract would allow of it. We now go farther, and maintain that the word "is," cannot have the sense of "signify or be a symbol of." We prove this,

1st. By the fact that no translations, ancient or modern, with any pretension to character so render the word. We as-

---

* Zwingle did not originate this interpretation. He adopted it, from Honius, a contemporary whose name is now almost forgotten. Zwingle's account of the growth of his own theory is very interesting. He says: "I saw that the words: 'This is my body,' are figurative, *but I did not see in what word the figure lay.* At this point, by the grace of God, it happened that two learned and pious men, came to consult on this matter; and when they heard our opinion (for they had concealed their own, for it was not then safe to express opinions on the subject freely) they thanked God and gave me in an untied package the letter of a learned and pious Hollander (Honius). *In it I found this precious pearl, that 'is' here means 'signifies.'* When we were compelled to explain our opinions openly it seemed more discreet, to open with that key, the word in which the figure lies, than simply to say: It is a figure."—(*Opera, Turic.*, 1832. *Vol. III.* 606.)

This frank history shows that Zwingle framed his theory first, and cherished it for some time before he could see how the Word of God was to be harmonized with it. Even when he came to see that "is" means "signifies," he could find no evidence of it, till it was revealed to him in that extraordinary vision of the man of dubious color, which was so mercilessly ridiculed in the Old Controversies.

sert, after a careful examination of all of those that have most reputation, that not one so translates the word, whether they originate in the Eastern, Western, Lutheran or Reformed Churches. No man of character has ever dared to insert into the text of his translation: This *is a symbol of* My body.

2d. No impartial dictionary of the Greek, whether general or New Testament, assigns such a meaning to the word. Where such a meaning is assigned, it is manifestly for the very purpose of promoting this false view, for doctrinal reasons.

3d. No good dictionary of the English assigns such a meaning to the English verb "to be;" no good dictionary of the Hebrew or of any language of which we know anything, assigns such a meaning to the verb corresponding in each with our verb to be, or with the Greek Eimi.

4th. The expositors and dogmaticians who, for philosophical or theological reasons, have been forced to maintain that the word "is" means "is a symbol of," have utterly failed to produce a *solitary instance* in which the word is so used.

Let us look at some of the passages that have been cited to prove that "is" may mean "is a symbol of." Passages such as these are favorites: "I *am* the vine, ye *are* the branches." "I *am* the door." "I *am* the bread of life." But if the word "is" means "is a symbol of," then Christ would say: "I *am the symbol* of a vine," "I *am the symbol* of a door," "I *am the symbol* of bread," which is absurd.

Nor do such passages as 1 Cor. x. 4, help the symbolical theory at all: "They all drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed (or went with them): and that Rock was Christ." The meaning of that passage is, that the real spiritual Rock which attended them was the manifested Jehovah, that is, the second person of the Trinity, Christ Himself in His pre-existent state. God is a rock; God is our true support; our true support is God. The resolution into the literal lies in the word rock, not in the word "is." So when we say, Christ *is* the door, the vine, the foundation, the corner-stone, the resolution of the expression into what is absolutely literal, turns not upon the word "is," but on the word "door," "vine," or

other noun, as the case may be. If you take Webster's Dictionary, or any other good dictionary, you will not find that the substantive verb "to be," means to signify, but you will find that the fifth meaning given to the word door is, "means of approach;" and you will find as proof of the meaning, it quotes: "I am the door; by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." But if when we say, Christ *is* the door, we do not mean Christ is the symbol of the door, neither can we mean when we say, the door is Christ, that the door is the symbol of Christ. We mean in the one case, that Christ is really and truly, not symbolically, the door—that is, He is the real means of approaching God; and in the other, that the true and real means of approach, the real door, is truly (not symbolizes) Christ. When I point to a particular door, and say, that door *is a symbol of* Christ, the word door is literal, and means a door of wood; but when I say the door is Christ, the word door is not taken literally, but the word *is* must be so taken. Christ is the vine, the vine is Christ—Christ is not a symbol of the vine, but is the true vine itself; the true vine is not a symbol of Christ, but is Christ. We say that Washington was the pillar of his country, or the pillar of our country was Washington; no more meaning that the pillar was a symbol of Washington, than that Washington was the symbol of a pillar; but meaning that Washington was the true pillar of our country, and that the true pillar of our country was Washington; the word pillar meaning in each case a support. We could not lay hold of a literal pillar and say: Lean on this, trust in this; this is that General Washington who fought for our country. We could not bring a man a vine and say: Attach yourself to this vine; this is Christ: or direct him to a particular door, and say: Go through, enter in, this door is Christ.

There is no parallel in the interpretation of dreams. "The three branches (are) three days." Gen. xl. 12. "The seven good kine (are) seven years, and the seven good ears (are) seven years." Gen. xli. 26. "The seven thin kine (are) seven years of famine." 1. There is no "are" in the origi-

nal. 2. The "branches," "kine," and "ears" are not real branches, real kine, nor real ears, but the ideals of a dream. It is not three branches, but the three branches of the dream that are three days. The seven dream-branches, dream-kine, and dream-ears are, to speak literally—to drop the idea of a dream—seven years. 3. If "is," in interpreting a dream, and because it so interprets, meant "signifies," it would have no bearing on the Lord's Supper, which is not the interpretation of a dream. 4. "The seven empty ears *shall be* seven years of famine." Does that mean "shall signify," as if they did not equally signify then? or does it mean that the empty ears, if we express what they really are and are to be, shall be "seven years of famine"? 5. Would the inference be justifiable from this dream, that: Take, eat; these are seven ears prepared for your food—means that there were no ears, but only symbols of ears? Pluck and strip; these are branches covered with delicious fruit—that there were no branches, no fruit, but symbols of them? If it would not, there is no parallel.

Nor does the passage on which Zwingle dwelt as the decisive one opened to him in a dream, by a spirit too flitting to leave a trace of his color, support the sagacity of the spirit. It would heighten the probability of his having any of the hues of pearls or help the exegesis of his sore-pressed friend. Exod. xii. 11: "It (*is*) the Lord's Passover."

Zwingle assumes that "it" means "the lamb," and that the sentence consequently results: "The lamb is the Passover," that is, the lamb signifies, or is the sign of the Passover.

But 1: The word "is," is not there. 2: The "it," does not refer to the lamb—but to the whole transaction which takes place with girded loins, and the eating of the lamb. The "it" is used indefinitely, as if we would say, "Let us gather round the cheerful hearth, let us light up the children's tree, for it is Christmas." The reason of the name "Passover," follows in the twelfth verse. "It is the Lord's Passover. For I will pass through the land." What sense is there in the words: The lamb is a symbol of the Passover, for I will pass through

it?" 3: In no sense in which the word "Passover" could hold, whether in the act of angelic transition, or the feast instituted to commemorate it, could the lamb signify, or be a symbol of it. The lamb was that whose body was literally slain, and whose blood was literally shed, in making the Passover Covenant. It was not a symbol of the passing over of the angel, for there is no analogy between a slain lamb and a passing over. It was not a symbol of the Feast of the Passover, but the chief material of the feast. Nor was the lamb a memorial of the original passing over. The Passover feast itself, as a whole was. Nor was the lamb a memorial of this feast, but simply a chief element in it. 4: The word "Passover" here means the festival. Not the transition itself. 5: If the lamb could be called the Passover feast, it would be so called. Not because it signified the feast, but because the feast was made on it. 6: If the words were, 'Take, eat, this is the body of the Paschal Lamb slain for you,' could Zwingle's interpretation of the verse in question overthrow the literal meaning of "is" in them? If not there is no parallel.

The allegory seems no better as a parallel. The allegory leads us into a world, where a being or thing is the designed ideal representative of another. The bundle on Christians back, is the burden of sin. The lions are terrors in the way. Vanity Fair is the godless world, the dark river is death—that is, says the slovenly interpreter, signifies or is a sign of. Now an actual burden in real life, may be a symbol of a spiritual burden; living lions may be symbols of the terrible, a real river a symbol of death, but the bundle, lions, river of the allegory are as ideal as the symbol. In an allegory, moreover, the framer has the reality in his mind before the ideal representative. The real is throughout the *subject*, the allegorical representative the *predicate*. Hence to put in their proper attitude both as to time and logical relation, we should say the burden of sin, is the bundle on Christian's back; the terrors are the lions; death is the dark river. That is the meaning even in the inverted order in which we first put them—but the burden of sin is not the symbol of a bundle—death not the symbol

of a river. Hence the structure of an allegory, not only does not sustain the Zwinglian interpretation of the words of the institutor but overthrows it—for it demonstrates that the subject is not the symbol of the predicate, but Zwingle's theory assumes that it is. But were it otherwise the Lord's Supper is no allegory.

A more dangerous falsity in interpretation, than the assumption that the word "is" may be explained in the sense of "signify," or "be a symbol of," is hardly conceivable. Almost every doctrine of the Word of God will melt under it. "The Word *was* God" would mean, "The Word signified, was a symbol of God." "God is a Spirit," would mean, "God is the symbol of a Spirit." When it is said of Jesus Christ: "This is the true God," it would mean that He is the symbol or image of the true God. By it Christ would cease to be the way, the truth, and the life, and would be a mere symbol of them; would no longer be the door, the vine, the Good Shepherd, the Bishop of Souls, but would be the symbol of a door, the sign of a vine, the figure of a shepherd, the representation of a Bishop. This characteristic of the use of "is" is essential to the very morality of language, and language itself would commit suicide if it could tolerate the idea that the substantive verb shall express not substance but symbol. Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification would all fuse and be dissipated in the crucible of this species of interpretation. It would take the Bible from us, and lay upon our breasts, cold and heavy, a Swedenborgian night-mare of correspondences. The Socinian, and the Pelagian, and all errorists of all schools, would triumph in the throwing of everything into hopeless confusion, and the Infidel would feel that the Book he has so long feared and hated, deprived, as it now would be, of its vitality by the trick of interpreters, could, henceforth, be safely regarded with contempt.

Well might Luther write upon the table at Marburg: "This is My body;" simple words, framed by infinite wisdom, so as to resist the violence and all the ingenuity of men. Rationalism in vain essays to remove them with its cunning, its learning, and its philosophy. Fanaticism gnashes its teeth at them

in vain. They are an immovable foundation for faith in the Sacramental mystery, and the gates of hell cannot shake the faith of the Church, that our Lord Jesus with the true body and true blood which He gave for our redemption on the Cross, is truly present in the Holy Supper, to *apply* the redemption through the very organs by which it was *wrought out.* The sacrifice was made once for all—its application goes on to the end of time. The offence of the Master's Cross now rests upon His table, and thither the triumph of the Cross shall follow it. On the Cross and at the table the saints discern the body of the Lord, and in simple faith are determined to know in both nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

III. *The Species of Bread and Wine.*

Transubstantiation; Romanism; and Rationalism.

The Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession declares that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present in the Supper "UNDER THE FORM (*unter der Gestalt*) OF BREAD AND WINE." The word "form" and the German word "*Gestalt*," which it translates, are renderings, confessedly, of the Latin term "species." The Apology (164, 54, 57: illis rebus quæ videntur, *sichtbaren Dingen*), giving an equivalent of the word "species" or "form" defines it, "those things which are seen, the visible things, bread and wine," and the Formula of Concord (674, 126) speaks of "the elements or visible species or form of the consecrated bread and wine." The word "species" belongs to the common terms of Theology, and is used by Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Zwinglian authors. It is used, for example, in the articles of the Marburg Colloquy, which were signed by Zwingle. In classic Latin "species" not only means "a form," but "an object presented to the sight"; not only "figure," but the "nature of a thing." It also has the meaning "kind," hence the phrase "communion in both kinds," "both species." So in English we use the words "species" and "kind" as convertible.

The emphasis in the Tenth Article is not on the word *species*, but on *bread* and *wine*—not as if it meant the *species, not the*

reality; but, on the contrary, the species or kinds of *true bread* and *true wine*, not *of the accidents* of them. In a word, it asserts that the visible objects in the Lord's Supper are real bread and real wine. The doctrine of the Confession is that the visible and earthly *element* in the Lord's Supper is *true bread* and *true wine* (*not* their *accidents*), as the invisible and heavenly element is the body and blood of Christ (not their *symbols*, nor the *memory* of them, nor *their spiritual virtue*).

The words, FIRST OF ALL, reject the doctrine of *Transubstantiation.*

SECONDLY: They repudiate the Romish doctrine of *sacramental concomitance*, to wit: that because of their *natural association*, or concomitance, both the body and blood of Christ are given, with each of the species *sacramentally*, that is, with the bread both body and blood are given *sacramentally*, and with the wine both blood and body are given *sacramentally*. The confession implies that the body only is given *sacramentally* by the bread. The blood only is *sacramentally* given by the wine. That from a natural concomitance we cannot argue to a *sacramental* one, for the *sacramental* is wholly supernatural, and its character depends on the will of Christ who has appointed one species for the *sacramental* impartation of His body, the other for the *sacramental* impartation of His blood.

THIRDLY: In this the confession implies that the two species or kinds, bread and wine, must both be used in order to having a complete communion, and thus the doctrine is set forth, which involves a rejection of the Romish abuse of the denial of the cup, which applies not only to the laity, but to the *communicant*, whether lay or priestly. The priestly offerer of the *sacrifice* of the mass drinks of the cup, in making the *sacrifice*, but when the same man approaches the table as a communicant, he receives only the bread.

FOURTHLY: In limiting the presence of the body and blood first to the communicants (*vescentibus*) and secondly, to the Lord's Supper, (*adsint in Cœna*) the confession implies that nothing has a sacramental character apart from its sacramental use: That the presence of the body and blood of Christ is such

that only the communicants can actualize it—it is not a presence for mice and worms, but for man: and that this presence is limited to the Supper: The body and blood of Christ cannot be reserved, laid up in monstrances, or carried in procession.

FIFTHLY: In this denial of a change of the elements, and in the maintenance, that the presence is, one to be actualized, *solely* by the *sacramental eating and drinking*, is involved the rejection of the doctrine, that the species in the Supper are to be worshiped, or that Christ Himself is to be worshiped as in the species. We can and should worship Christ at His table, but precisely as we worship Him away from it. He did not say, Take, Worship, but: Take, eat. He did not say, this is My Divinity, but this is My body, and the bread which we break is not the shrine of His Deity, but the "Communion of His body."

On the FIRST of these points as conditioning all the rest, we shall dwell more fully than on the others.

The word "Transubstantiation" was as unknown to pure antiquity as the doctrine couched under it. It first appears in the Twelfth Century. The first official use of the term was made in the Lateran Council of 1215. The doctrine of Transubstantiation affirms that at the consecrating words the substance of bread and wine ceases to be, and in their place, clothed with their accidents or properties, are the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; no bread, no wine, but simply Christ's body, looking like bread, tasting like bread, feeling like bread, nourishing the body like bread, corrupted like bread, eaten by mice like bread, conjoined with poison killing the body like poisoned bread, bearing on it the baker's mark like bread; but no bread, only body; that there is no wine, but Christ's blood smelling like wine, red if the wine have been red, white if the wine have been white, intoxicating like wine, spilling like wine, leaving permanent stains like wine, poisoning if mixed with poison like poisoned wine, pronounced by chemical analysis to be wine, depositing the acids and salts like wine, but throughout no wine.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation is a doctrine not only un-

taught in the Scriptures, but directly in conflict with their letter. It is in conflict with the analogy of faith, overthrowing logically indubitable parts of the faith; it is in conflict with the nature of a sacrament, to which are required two real elements, the real earthly as well as the real heavenly; it is in conflict with a fair parallel with Holy Baptism, in which it is not pretended by the Church of Rome that there is any transubstantiation of the water; it is a doctrine utterly unknown to Christian antiquity, the demonstrable invention of ages of corruption, resisted by many of the greatest theologians even under the Papacy, and the nurse of superstition, and of the grossest idolatry; it is in conflict with the testimony of the senses, subversive of all the laws of moral evidence, and by overstretching faith into credulity, tends to produce by reaction, universal skepticism. An acute nation which swings into Transubstantiation, swings out of it into Atheism.

This Doctrine of the mediæval Church of Rome was very early and very positively rejected by Luther, and our other great Reformers. In 1520, Luther, in his book on the Babylonish Captivity, says: "For more than twelve hundred years the Church held the right faith," (in regard to the Lord's Supper,) "and never do the holy *fathers* make mention of that *portentous word* and *dream*, Transubstantiation." In 1522, in his book against Henry VIII., he says, "What they (the Romanists) hold in regard to *Transubstantiation* is the merest *figment* of the godless and blind Thomists;" and again, "I declare it to be *impious* and *blasphemous* for any one to assert that the bread is transubstantiated." It were easy, if need were, to fill pages with testimony of this kind; but it is needless.

The Romanists, in their Confutation, objected to the Tenth Article that it does not teach Transubstantiation, and, what they there say, or what was said by their great theological representatives at the Diet, is most important as showing how the Confession was there understood, and, of course, how it is to be understood now.

An examination of their official Confutation at once silences the pitiful old libel that the Roman Catholics accepted the Tenth

Article *without reservation.* The latest repeater of this ignorant if not malicious assertion, is Rev. Wm. Good, by whom it has been the great misfortune of the Low Church Party in England to seem to be represented. He quotes, at second hand, we judge, (from the pages of one of the bitterest zealots against the Lutheran Church), four words, drawn from the Papal Confutation, which would lead his readers to suppose that the Papists simply assented to the Tenth Article as being sound, and hence he draws the inference that the Article teaches the Romish view. All this is built on an isolation of four words out of more than a hundred. The Romish Confutation, so far as it bears upon this point, literally translated, runs thus :

"The Tenth Article *in words* offends nothing, when they confess that in the Eucharist after consecration legitimately made, the body and blood of Christ are substantially and truly present, *provided that* (*si modo*) they believe, that under *each species*, the entire Christ is present, so that by *concomitance*, the blood of Christ is no less under the species of bread than it is under the species of wine, and so of the other. Otherwise in the Eucharist, the body of Christ would be bloodless, contrary to St. Paul, that Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more.—Rom. vi.

" *One thing is to be added as an Article exceedingly necessary* (*valide necessarium,*) to this Confession, that they shall believe the Church, (rather than some who falsely teach otherwise), that by the omnipotent Word of God, in the consecration of the Eucharist, the *substance of the bread is changed into the body of Christ.*"

Here it is clear, first, that so far as the Romanists give their approval at all to the Tenth Article, it is of the most reserved kind. First, they speak of the " words " only, as not offensive on the one point that there is a true presence. It is the only case in which they qualify their approval by terms which imply a suspicion that " the words " may not fairly convey what is meant. Hoffmeister indeed expresses this insinuation, " unless, indeed they wish to impose upon us by a likeness of words."

Second, They declare that even these words are not offen-

sive, solely, if they be so interpreted as to include the idea of concomitance, which it is not pretended they express; they carefully note that the Article *does not teach Transubstantiation*, in this acknowledging that that doctrine is not implied as has been pretended, in the word "species." In fact as the Confession does not teach concomitance, but by implication rejects it, the Romish Confutation does not really endorse heartily a single word of it.

The discussion of the Tenth Article by John Cochlæus, sheds no less light on the understanding of the Article by the Romanists at the time. This bitter enemy of the Reformation, who was one of those who drew up the Confutation, says: "Though that Article be brief, *there are many things of which we complain as wanting in it*, (*multa tamen in eo desideramur*). Luther frivolously denying Transubstantiation, though in words he disputes at large against Zwingle and Œcolampadius, *yet in the thing itself*, he thinks with them, and is in collusion with them, (*cum eis colludit*). And Luther's followers have reached such a pitch of madness, that they *refuse longer to adore the Eucharist*, because Luther has impiously taught that it is safer not to adore, and has openly *denied the doctrine of concomitance.* And now they have proceeded in the fury of their impiety to such a degree as to deny that the body of Christ remains in the consecrated Host, except in the use at the altar, (*extra altaris usum.*) Hence they falsely and impiously call us idolaters, because we retain the body of the Lord in the consecrated Host in the Tabernacles, (*Cibariis,*) for infirm Communicants, or when we bear it (the body) about in monstrances and processions." He quotes Melancthon's words in the Apology, "with those things which are seen, the bread and wine," as flagrantly contradictory of Transubstantiation, (*turpiter contradicit sibi ipsi.*)*

---

* On the History and Literature of the Papal Confutation, which has great value in the interpretation and defence of the Augsburg Confession, see the works following:

Brill auf d. evangel. Augapfel, 1629. 4, (the German translation of the work of Fabricius Leodius mentioned below).

Danz: Augsburg Confess., Jena, 1829. 12mo. § 6.

In this connection it is worth noticing that, widely as Romanism, with its Transubstantiation, and Rationalism, with its Symbol, differ in their results, they run into their error by the same fallacious principle of interpretation—each applying it with the same arbitrariness, but to different objects.

The Romanist wishes to do away with the Scripture testimony in regard to the bread and wine; and, although they bear their name *before* the Lord's Supper, *during* the Lord's Supper, and *after* the Lord's Supper, he insists that there is neither bread nor wine there, but only their accidents. While our Lord says: "This is my body," the Romanist in effect makes it: This seeming bread is no longer bread, but has become, has been transubstantiated into My body. He deserts the letter and reaches Transubstantiation.

The Rationalist wishes to retain the bread and wine, and therefore holds that what the Scripture *calls* bread and wine,

---

CHYTRÆUS. Hist. Aug. Conf., 119. (Confutation, 173, seq.) Ger. Edit., 1577, p. 191.

CŒLESTINUS l. 192 seq. Confutation III.

CYPRIAN. 87, seq.

FEUERLIN: Biblioth Symbol.

FICKENSCHER: Gesch. d. Reichst. z. Augsburg, 1830, III. 324.

FOERSTEMANN: URKUNDENBUCH, 2 vols. 8vo. Halle, 1835, II. 133–176.

FRANCKE: Lib. Symb. Eccl. Luth. Lips. 1847. 12mo. Proleg. xxx–xxxiii. (Confutation, Append. 43–69.

GABLER: Nat. Theol. Jour., 1801, 443 seq.

HASE: Lib. Symb. Eccles. Evangel. Lips. 1827. 2 vols. 12mo. Proleg. lxxiv–lxxvi. The Confutation, lxxvi–cxiv.

HOFFMANN: Comment, in A. C. Tubing., 1727. 4to. 205–213.

KÖLLNER: Symb. d. Luther. Kirche. Hamb. 1837, p. 397–416.

MÜLLER, C. C.: Formulæ Confutationis A. C. Lat. Germ. Lips., 1808, 8vo.

MULLER, J. J.; Hist. v. Protest u. A. C. Jena, 1705, 4to. p. 653.

PFAFF: Lib. Symbol Eccl. Luth.

PLANCK: Protest. Lehrbeg. III. I. 52 seq.

ROTERMUNI; Gesch. d. z Augsb. übergeb. Glaubensbek. Hannov. 1829, 8vo. 109–116.

SALIG: I. 224 seq. 378 seq.

SECKENDORF: Hist. Luth. II. 171.

SEMLER: Apparat: in L. S. p. 73.

SPIEKER, C. G: Conf. Fidei. Confutation. &c. Berlin, 1830. 8vo. 149–204.

WALCHII, J. G: Introd. in L. S. 416. Miscellan. Sacra. 205.

WEBER: Krit. Gesch. II. Vorred., and p. 439.

is bread and wine; but he wishes to do away with the Scripture testimony in regard to the body and blood; and although the Scripture says, that of that which the Saviour tells them to Take, eat, He declares most explicitly, This is My body; and of that which He tells them to drink, He says, This is My blood—though it says that the bread is the communion of His body and the cup the communion of His blood—though it declares that the guilt of the heedless communicant is that he does not "discern the Lord's body," and that he that eateth and drinketh unworthily is guilty of the body and blood of Christ; in the face of all this he insists that there is in the Lord's Supper only the shadow, image, or sign of the body and blood of Christ, not the true body and true blood. With what face can a Rationalist meet a Romanist, or a Romanist meet a Rationalist? No wonder that the Rationalist, after all, is less violent against Romanism than against the pure doctrine of our Church. There is the secret affinity of error between them; and Romanism does not so hate Rationalism, Rationalism does not so hate Romanism, as both hate unswerving fidelity to the Word of God.

That the Romish and rationalizing modes of interpretation are nearer to each other than either is to the Lutheran, is admitted by both Rationalists and Romanists. The rationalizing interpreters make it one of the common-places of objection to the Lutheran view, that it has *less* in a literal interpretation of the Scripture to sustain it than the Romish view has: that is, the Romish view is less decisively opposed than the Lutheran is, to rationalistic modes of literal interpretation.

On the Romish side Bellarmine and others take the ground that right principles of interpretation lead either to Romanistic or Calvinistic views of the Supper. As both these have the common ground that the proposition of the Supper is: "This bread is Christ's body," and as both argue that real bread cannot be real body, the one escapes the difficulty by maintaining that there is no real bread in the Supper, the other that there is no real body there; or, in other words, the Romanist, Zwinglian, and Calvinist agree in an exegetical principle, and simply vary in the application of it.

A single citation from two great authorities, the first Roman Catholic, the second Calvinistic, will demonstrate this. BELLARMINE in his Discussion of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, ch. XIX. says, "These words: 'This is My body,' necessarily lead to the inference either that there is a *true mutation of the bread*, as the CATHOLICS will have it, or a *metaphorical mutation*, as the CALVINISTS will have it; but in no way admit of the LUTHERAN view."

URSINUS, in his Explanation of the Catechism, II., Q. 78: "As it is not true that the Papists retain the verbally literal, so it is *much less true* (*multo minus verum*) that those (Lutherans) retain the letter and true sense of the words." "The letter is: 'This, that is, this bread, is My body;' the meaning is, 'That visible, broken, and distributed bread is My true and essential body'—not by essential conversion, but mystically or by sacramental metonomy, because the words according to the verbally literal, have a sense repugnant to the verity of the Christian faith: therefore we say, that in the words of Christ a fitting (*conveniens*) meaning is to be taught." Do. p. 541. This then is the genesis of the two views: Body cannot be be bread, but as there *is* body there is no bread: bread cannot be body, but as there *is* bread there is no body.

With such a principle, only a third possibility remains: it is to apply it rigidly and consistently to every part of the Institution, to take away the bread with the Romanist, and the body with the Rationalist, and then we have the Lord's Supper of the Quaker and other mystics, with neither supernatural reality nor outward element—all idea, all spirit. The extravagance of the Romish materializing of the presence of Christ's body, and of the rationalistic exaggeration, which leaves only natural matter, run into the nihilism of the mystic. You cannot annihilate either element in the Lord's Supper without annihilating both.

In the doctrine of Transubstantiation, nevertheless, as in almost all of her corruptions, the Church of Rome has not so much absolutely removed the foundation, as hidden it by the wood, hay, and stubble of human device. Truth can some-

times be reached by running the corruptions of it back to the trunk on which they were grafted. Such an error as that of Transubstantiation could never have been grafted on an original faith like that of Zwingle in regard to the Lord's Supper. The tendency of the Zwinglian view, if it be corrupted, is to laxer, not to higher, views of the sacramental mystery. Such an error as the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary never could have been grafted on a faith originally Socinian. It is a corruption which presupposes as a truth, to be corrupted in its inference, the divinity and sinlessness of our Lord Jesus Christ; and just as the comparatively modern corruption of the worship of the Virgin is a proof that faith in the Godhead of Jesus Christ was part of the primitive faith, so does the comparatively modern corruption of Transubstantiation prove that faith in the objective supernatural presence of the body and blood of our Lord was part of the primitive faith. A rotten apple always presupposes a sound apple. However corrupt a fig may be, we know that it grew on a fig-tree, and not on a thistle.

4. *The Sacramental Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ—Zwinglian and Calvinistic Views—Concessions of Un-Lutheran Writers.*

Our fourth proposition in the analytic exhibition of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession is:

That the true body and blood of Christ, truly present in the Lord's Supper, under the species of bread and wine, *are communicated.**

We have virtually proved this proposition in proving the three which preceded it. Nevertheless, in the affluence of Scripture evidence sustaining the doctrine of our Church, we can well afford to give this thesis a distinct vindication. We affirm, then, that this fourth proposition is explicitly taught in 1 Cor. x. 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not

---

* German, ausgetheilt; Lat., distribuantur. In the Apology; Lat., exhibeantur; German, dargereicht.

the communion [κοινωνία] of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion [κοινωνία] of the body of Christ?" This passage, in its express terms and in its connection, is what Luther calls it—a thunderbolt upon the heads of errorists in regard to the Lord's Supper. The figment of Transubstantiation is overthrown by it, for it expressly mentions bread, and that which communicates cannot be identical with that which is communicated by it. St. Paul expressly mentions the two elements; the bread, which is the earthly; the body of our Lord, which is the heavenly; the sacramental union and the impartation of the heavenly in, with, and under the earthly. The passage equally overthrows all the Rationalistic corruptions of the doctrine. Zwingle says: The bread is the *sign* of the body; Paul says: The bread is the *communion* of the body; Zwingle says: The wine is the *sign* of the blood; Paul says: The cup is the *communion* of the blood. On Zwingle's theory, any and all bread is as such the sign of Christ's body; on Paul's theory, it is the bread which *we break*, that is, the sacramental bread only, which is the communion of Christ's body; on Zwingle's theory, any wine and all wine is, as such, the sign of Christ's blood; on Paul's theory, only the cup *of blessing, which we bless*, in the Supper, is the communion of Christ's blood; on Zwingle's theory the relation of the bread and body is that of symbol and of reality; on Paul's theory, it is the relation of communicating medium and of the thing communicated; on Zwingle's theory, we receive the cup to be reminded of the blood; on Paul's theory, we receive the cup to receive the blood. On Zwingle's theory, the argument of the Apostle is sophistical and pointless in the last degree, for as all bread is equally an emblem of Christ's body as food for the soul, and all wine equally an emblem of Christ's blood as the refreshing of the soul, any and every eating of bread, and any and every drinking of wine, would be the communion of His body and blood; therefore, to eat bread and to drink wine at the table of Demons, would be, on Zwingle's theory of symbol, to have communion with Christ's body and blood; for bread is a symbol of nourishment, wine a symbol of re-

freshing, without reference to the time or place of receiving them; their whole character as symbols depends on what bread is, as bread—on what wine is, as wine; and the Corinthian could make the table of Demons a Lord's Supper by the simple mental act of thinking of the bread and wine as symbols of Christ's body and blood. A vine, as a symbol of Christ, is equally a symbol, whether it grows on the land of devil-worshipers or of Christians; bread, as a symbol of Christ's body, is equally a symbol, whether baked by Atheist, Jew, or Pagan; whether eaten at the table of Demons or at the table of the Lord. The logic of Zwingle's position is, then, exactly the opposite of that of the Apostle, and would make his conclusion in the last degree absurd.

Equally do the words overthrow the Calvinistic theory. Calvin's theory is, that the Holy Spirit communicates the body of Christ; Paul's is, that the bread communicates it; he mentions but two elements, bread and body. Calvin says, the Holy Spirit communicates the blood of Christ; Paul says, that the cup communicates it, two elements only again, cup and blood, not three: cup, Holy Spirit, and blood. Calvin makes faith the communicating medium; Paul says, the bread we break, the cup we bless, is the communicating medium. Calvin makes the communion of the body and blood of Christ, one which is confined to worthy recipients, true believers, while to all others there is but the communication of bread and wine; Paul is speaking of what the communion also is to some who "eat and drink unworthily, "not discerning the Lord's body," "eating and drinking damnation to themselves," "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," and yet he affirms that to them the bread communicates the body, the cup, the blood of Christ. Calvin's communion is one which can take place anywhere and always, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is always present, and faith can always be exercised; Paul's is expressly limited to that with which the bread and cup are connected. Calvin's is a communion of the virtue and efficacy of the body and blood of Christ; Paul's is a communion of the body and blood themselves. Calvin's is the communion of an absent

body and blood; Paul's the communion of a present body and blood, so present that bread, broken and given, imparts the one, and the cup, blessed and taken, imparts the other. Calvin talks of a faith by which we spiritually eat an absent body, Paul of elements by which we sacramentally eat a present body.

As by Zwingle's theory, so by Calvin's also, the argument of the Apostle here is emptied of all force. For the argument of the Apostle is addressed to those who eat and drink unworthily, that is to those who had not faith. The very necessity of the argument arises from the presupposition of a want of true faith in the Lord, on the part of those to whom it was addressed. But on the Calvinistic theory the communion of the body and blood of Christ and participation in them, are confined to those who have faith. These Corinthians therefore, had St. Paul taught them a theory like that of Calvin, might have replied: 'O, no! as we are without true faith, and are receiving unworthily, we receive nothing but bread and wine, but as bread and wine, were not the sacrifices, which Christ offered to God, we do not come into fellowship with God's altar by partaking of *them*—therefore we are not guilty of what you charge on us, to wit, the inconsistency of eating, and drinking at the same time, of the sacrifices offered on God's altar, and of the sacrifices offered on the altar of Demons.' The Calvinistic theory makes the argument of the Apostle an absurdity.

Two parallels in the connection help to bring out very vividly the Apostle's idea. One is the parallel with Israel: v. 18. "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which *eat of the sacrifices* partakers of the altar?" The point seems to be most clearly this: that the communion of the body of Christ in the Supper is as real as the eating of the animal sacrifices in the Jewish Church. Christ's body is the true sacrifice which takes once for all the place of the Jewish sacrifices, and the sacramental communion, in which that body is the sustenance, in ever renewing application of the one only sacrifice, takes the place of the Jewish eating of the sacrifice. The other parallel is with the eating the sacrifices and drinking of the cup

offered to idols, v. 21. The communion of the body and blood of Christ is represented as no less real in its nature and positive in its results than the other communication of the sacrificial flesh and cup.

The parallel may be offered thus to the eye, as regards the Jews and the Christians.

Israel after the flesh, or	Israel after the spirit, or
the Jews,	Christians,
have the typical sacrifice,	have the real sacrifice,
of the body,	of the body,
and blood,	and blood,
of animals,	of Christ,
on the typical altar,	on the true altar,
and eat	and eat
of the typical sacrifice	of the true sacrifice
of animal body and blood	of Christ's body and blood
at the Jewish Festival,	at the Christian festival,
the sacrificial supper,	the Lord's Supper,
and thus partake	and thus partake
of the typical altar.	of the true altar.

Here the parallel is between type and truth—in the parallel between Pagans and Christians it is between falsehood and truth.

In a word the whole argument involves a parallel between three things:

I. The Sacrificial meal of the Jews.

II. The Sacrificial meal of the Pagans.

III. The Sacrificial meal of the Christians, or Lord's Supper.

The common idea that underlies the triple parallel is, that in each of these meals there is a true communion, communication, or impartation of the thing sacrificed, whereby the receiver is brought into the fellowship of the Altar, on which it was sacrificed, and thus into fellowship with the being to whom it was sacrificed—the Pagan with the Demons, the Jew with God as hidden in type, the Christian with God unveiled, and incarnate in Christ.

The parallel in the thought in Hebr. xiii. 10–12 is also well worthy of notice: "We have an *altar*, whereof they have no right to *eat*, which serve the tabernacle. For the *bodies* of those beasts, whose *blood* is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin, are burnt without the camp. Wherefore, Jesus, also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate." Here is altar over against altar, body over against body, blood over against blood, sacrifice over against sacrifice, eating over against eating. We have the true altar over against the typifying altar, the true body, blood, and sacrifice of Christ over against the typifying body, blood and sacrifice of beasts, the true sacramental and communicating eating over against the typifying eating, which foreshadowed, but could not consummate a communion.

If language can express a thought unmistakably, the words of Paul (1 Cor. x.) imply, that, in the Lord's Supper, there is a supernatural reality, a relation between the bread and the body of Christ, which makes the one the medium of the reception of the other; that our atoning sacrifice, after a different manner, but a manner not less real than that of the sacrifice of Jew and Pagan, is communicated to us in the Holy Supper, as their sacrifices were given in their feasts. The Lord's Supper indeed may be regarded as a summing up of the whole fundamental idea of Old Testament sacrifice, a covenant consummated by sacrifice, and entered into by the covenanting parties, receiving, each after the mode appropriate to him, that which is sacrificed; the Almighty Father, accepting His Son, as the Victim offered for the sins of the whole world, and the world accepting in the Holy Supper the precious body and blood which apply in perpetual renewal through all generations, the merits of the oblation made, once for all, upon the Cross.

The interpretation of these passages implied by our Church in her Confession is sustained by the universal usage of the Church Catholic, by the judgment of the greatest of the fathers. Greek and Latin, by the opinion of the most eminent dogmaticians and expositors, ancient and modern, and even by the concessions of interpreters who reject the Lutheran faith.

1. The whole Church from the earliest period has called, and now calls the Lord's Supper, the Communion. That Supper alone has this name. But what solution of the sole application of this name can be given except that in it the body and blood of Christ are communicated and received as they are no where else. The universal Christian consciousness, and language attest the supernatural reality of the presence of the body and blood of Christ.

2. The drift of *patristic* interpretation may be gathered from the extracts which follow:

Ignatius: (Ordained by the Apostle Peter, ab. A. D. 43, d. 107). "The Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ. There is one cup for the uniting (ἕνωσιν) of His blood."

Justin Martyr: (d. 165). "The food over which the Eucharistic prayer has been made is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus."

Irenæus: (d. 202). "When the mingled cup, and the broken bread receive the words of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ."

Ambrose. (d. 307). "We receiving of one bread and of one cup, are receivers and partakers of the body of the Lord."

Chrysostom: (d. 407). "Very persuasively and fearfully He speaks: For what He says is this, That very thing which is in this cup is that which flowed from His side, and of that we are partakers. Not only hath He poured it out, but He hath imparted of it to us all. What is more fearful than this. Yet, what more kindly affectioned? The bread which we break is it not the communion, (κοινωνια) of the body of Christ? Why does He not say Participation, (μετοχή)? Because He wished to signify something more (than participation,) and to indicate the greatness of the joining together." Theophylact * and John, of Damascus, adopt and repeat these words of Chrysostom.

* Theophylact: (1078.) "Non dixit participatio, sed communicatio ut aliquid excellentius indicet puta summam unionem. Quid autem dicit hujusmodi est, hoc quod in calice est, illud est quod effluxit de latere Christi, et ex eo accipientes communicamus, id est unimur Christo."

JEROME: (d. 420). "Is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ? As the Saviour Himself saith: He who eateth my flesh and drinketh My blood, abideth in Me, and I in him."

THEODORET: (d. 456). "Enjoying the sacred mysteries, are we not partakers with Him, the Master?"

JOHN OF DAMASCUS: (d. 750). "As the body is united with the Logos, so also we are united with Him by this bread." "The Lord's Supper is called, and is in very deed a communion, (*κοινωνία*) because through it we commune (*κοινωνεῖν*) with Christ and become partakers of His flesh." Orthod. Fidei, lib. IV. XIV.

3. The Reformers of the Non-Lutheran tendency make important concessions.

CALVIN: "The thing itself is also present, nor does the soul less receive (percipiat) the communion of the blood, than we drink the wine with the mouth." "The wine is no longer a common drink, but dedicated to the spiritual nourishment of the soul, inasmuch as it is a token (tessera) of the blood of Christ."

PETER MARTYR: "Ye are of the body of Christ, His members, participants (participes) of His body and blood." "Christians have association and conjunction with one another, which hath its seat in this (in eo sita est), that they are participants of the body and blood of Christ."

But no witness to the cogency of the passage is perhaps so striking as that of ZUINGLE, who in the effort to explain away a text so fatal to his theory, falls upon this violent and extraordinary interpretation, "What, I ask, is the cup of blessing which we bless, EXCEPT OUR OWN SELVES (quam nos ipsi)? HE GIVES THE NAME OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST TO THOSE WHO TRUST IN HIS BLOOD. In this passage the communion of the blood of Christ are those who exult that they have obtained liberty in Christ's blood. ALL WE who are participants of one bread and one cup, ARE THE BLOOD OF CHRIST AND THE BODY OF CHRIST. We have treated this point somewhat more verbosely, but we have done it because this passage, either NOT UNDERSTOOD, OR BADLY INTERPRETED, even by many learned men, has given to

the simple, occasion of believing, that in the bread the body of Christ is eaten, and in the wine His blood is drunk." Who does not feel that Zuingle would have weakened his cause less by saying honestly, "I cannot harmonize this text with my view," than he has by an interpretation so forced as to look like evidence of purpose to make in any way God's words, square with a certain assumption?

4. A few distinguished names among English and American writers may be quoted. On these words, POOL, the great master among the old Puritan commentators, says: "The cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? that is, it is an action whereby and wherein Christ communicates Himself and His grace to us." "The bread is the communion of the body of Christ; an action wherein Christians have a fellowship and communion with Christ." It will be noticed that, in the face of the text, POOL substitutes "Christ" for "body of Christ," and again for "blood of Christ." Substitute the very term of the sacred Word for his substitute, and POOL is forced to say of the Lord's Supper: "It is an action whereby and wherein Christ communicates His blood to us," "an action whereby Christians have a fellowship and communion with the body of Christ," and this is, as far as it goes, the very doctrine of our Church.

Bishop WILSON'S paraphrase is: "The bread which we break, after consecration, is it not that by which we have communion with Christ, our Head?"

HUSSEY explains the "communion," "by spiritually partaking of the blood and body of Christ in the Eucharist."

The OLDER TRANSLATORS in English bring out the true sense very clearly: "Is not the cup of blessing, which we bless, partaking of the blood of Christ?" "Is not the bread which we break, partaking of the body of Christ?" Such is the rendering of the earliest and latest Tyndale, of Coverdale, of Cranmer, and of the Bishops. The first English translation, and for more than half a century the only one, which used the word "communion" was the Genevan, which was made at

Geneva by English religious fugitives who were strong Calvinists, and who here followed Beza, evidently for doctrinal reasons, as the marginal note shows. From the Genevan (1557) it went into the Authorized Version (1611), which obscures the Apostle's reasoning by rendering koinonia, in the sixteenth verse, communion, and koinonos, in the eighteenth verse, "partakers" and "fellowship."

HAMMOND translates the word *κοινωνια* "communication," and paraphrases it: "The Christian feast of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper is . . . . the making us partakers of the body and blood of Christ," and refers to his note on Acts ii. 42, in which he says: "The word koinonia is to be rendered, not *communion*, but *communication*, by that, meaning distribution . . . . or participation, by which any are made partakers of some gift. In this notion is the word generally used in Scripture for . . . . some kind of distributing or dispensing to others. . . . . So in 1 Cor. x. 16, the participating of the body and blood of Christ."

Bishop HALL (d. 1656): "That sacred cup . . . . is it not that wherein we have a joint communion with Christ, in partaking of His blood? The bread . . . is it not that wherein we . . . have communion with Christ, in a joint receiving of His body?"

Archbishop SHARP: "St. Paul here plainly teaches us that these sacred signs make those who use them to have communion with Christ crucified."

The WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY'S Annotations represent the communion as "a sign or pledge of the spiritual communion which we have together, who by faith *participate* in the body and blood of Christ."

MATTHEW HENRY says: "He lays down his argument from the Lord's Supper, *a feast on the sacrificed body and blood* of our Lord."

MACKNIGHT translates: "Is it (the cup of blessing) not the joint participation of the blood of Christ? Is it (the loaf which we break) not the joint participation of the body of Christ?"

ADAM CLARKE gives this as the force of the words: "We who partake of this sacred cup, in commemoration of the

death of Christ, are *made partakers of His body and blood*, and thus have fellowship with Him."

CONYBEARE and HOWSON thus paraphrase the words: "When we drink the cup of blessing which we bless, are we not all partakers in the blood of Christ? When we break the bread, are we not all partakers in the body of Christ?" and say in the note: "Literally, the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a common participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a common participation in the body of Christ?"

PARKHURST, in his Greek Lexicon, gives as the proper definition of koinonia in this passage, "a partaking, participation."

DR. ROBINSON defines the word, "a partaking, sharing," and cites 1 Cor. x. 16 as an illustration of the meaning "participation."

ALFORD: "Koinonia, the participation (*i. e.* that whereby the act of participation takes place) of the blood of Christ. The strong literal sense must here be held fast, as constituting the very kernel of the Apostle's argument. . . . . If we are to render this 'estin,' *represents* or *symbolizes*, THE ARGUMENT IS MADE VOID."

DR. JOHN W. NEVIN, in his Mystical Presence, speaking of the language in this place, says: "This much it does most certainly imply, that the communion is something *more than figurative or moral.* It is the communion of Christ's *body* and *blood*, a real participation in His true human life, as the one only and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world."

GILL, the great Baptist Rabbinist, on the words: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" says: "It is; for not only believers by this act have communion with His mystical body, the Church, *but with His natural body*, which was broken for them; they in a spiritual sense, and by faith, eat His flesh, as well as drink His blood, and partake of Him."

DR. SCHMUCKER, in his Catechism says, that "worthy communicants, *in this ordinance*, by faith spiritually feed on the

body and blood of the Redeemer, thus holding communion or fellowship with Him," and cites 1 Cor. x. 16 to prove it.

DR. HODGE, of Princeton, says: "It is here assumed, that partaking of the Lord's Supper brings us into communion with Christ. . . The Apostle's argument is founded on the assumption, that a participation of the cup is a participation of the blood of Christ; and that a participation of the bread is a participation of the body of Christ. Is it not the communion of the blood of Christ; that is, is it not the *means of participating* in the blood of Christ? He who partakes of the cup partakes of Christ's blood. . . . By partaking of the bread, we partake of the body of Christ."

5. We will cite as representative of GERMAN INTERPRETATION, four names: the first representing the Ancient Lutheran Orthodoxy; the second the intermediate Lutheran Theology of the 18th Century; the third the Unionistic Theology of our own era; and the fourth, a witness to the irresistible character of the text, which compels a rationalistic commentator to acknowledge its true force.

CALOVIUS: "The earthly thing, to wit the bread, is taken in an earthly manner: the heavenly thing, to wit the body of Christ, is taken and eaten in a manner fitting it, that is a heavenly or mystical manner. As that union is *sacramental* and is in mystery, and hence called *mystical*, the manner of eating which depends upon it, is as regards the body of Christ '*plainly*, *mystical*, *sacramental*, and *incomprehensible* to human reason,' as *Hunnius* correctly observes."

S. J. BAUMGARTEN: "The communion of the cup with the blood of Christ, can here be taken in a twofold mode: 1). The cup stands in communion with the blood of Christ—is a means of offering and imparting it. 2). The cup is a means of uniting the participants with the blood of Christ—a means whereby they are made participants of it. The second presupposes the first."

OLSHAUSEN: "Were there in the Supper no communion with Christ but in spirit, the words would be "Communion of Christ," not "communion of the body," "communion of the blood of Christ." As of course the language refers to Christ in His state of exaltation, it is of His glorified flesh and blood

it speaks: "these come in the Supper into attingence with the participant, and thus mediate the communion."

RUECKERT is the last name we shall cite, and as witness on the point here involved, no name could carry more force with it. Rueckert is one of the greatest scholars of the age, a historico-critical rationalist, at the furthest extreme from the Lutheran position, making it his peculiar boast that, rising above all Confessions and parties, he accepts the results of scientific exegesis. He professes to make it his law, "that you are to lend nothing that is yours to your author, and omit nothing that is his—you are not to ask what he ought to say, nor be afraid of what he does say." Rueckert, in his work on the Lord's Supper,* after a very thorough investigation of the sense of 1 Cor. x., says: "Paul . . sees in the Supper, Christ's body and blood . . as supersensuous and heavenly, which He gives as food and drink at His table to believers, and indeed without any exception, and without distinction between worthy and unworthy participants." He then shows that there is no possibility of evading the acceptance of the doctrine except by rejecting the authority of Paul, and by appealing to "the decision of rational thinking." Rationalism itself, in the person of one of its greatest representatives, being judge, it has no foothold in the text. Rueckert, moreover, confesses that the earliest faith of the Church agrees with this result of the latest scientific exegesis: "That in the Supper the body and blood of Christ are given and received, *was the universal faith*, from the beginning. . . . This faith abode in the aftertime; the Christian *people* (Gemeinde) never had any other, and in the Ancient Church it had not a solitary person to oppose it; the extremest heretics themselves never did it."

5. *The Communion of the Unworthy.*†

The Fifth Proposition in the analytical view of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession is:

That the true body and blood of Christ, truly present and

---

* 1856. P. 241, 297.

† See Seb. Schmidt: De princip. s. fundam. praes. Corpor. et Sanguin. Christi Argentor, 1699. Chap. xi.

truly communicated under the species of bread and wine, are *received by all communicants.**

"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (*or*, judgment) to himself, not discerning, (*διακρινων*) the Lord's body." (because he hath not distinguished the body,. . . Syr. Ether. Eateth and drinketh condemnation on himself, by not discerning. . . Syr. Murdock): "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty, *ἔνοχος* of the body and blood of the Lord," (is guilty of the blood of the Lord and of His body). Syr. Etheridge. 1 Cor. xi. 27–29.

From the four propositions already established it is a necessary inference, and in the cogent texts just quoted it is expressly taught, that, while none but those who receive in faith, receive savingly, all who come to the Supper receive *sacramentally*, the body and blood of Christ. As those to whom the gospel is a savor of death unto death, receive in common with those to whom it is a savor of life unto life, one and the same thing outwardly, to wit: the gospel; so do those who abuse, to their own condemnation, the Lord's Supper, and those who rightly use it to their soul's welfare, receive one and the same thing sacramentally. It is the very essence of the sin of the rejection of the gospel, that, receiving it outwardly, with the attendant energy of the Holy Spirit in, with, and under it, the rejector has not received it inwardly, and thus makes it not merely practically void, but pernicious to his soul. So is it the very essence of the sin of unworthy treatment of the Lord's Supper, that, receiving it in its sacred and divine element, as well as in its outward one, the communicant makes no inward appropriation of the benefit there offered, but turns, by his unbelief, the food of his soul to its poison. In the passages quoted immediately after the Thesis, men whose unworthiness is such, that their condemnation is sealed by their eating, are represented as guilty of the body and blood of Christ; that

---

* German: da . . genommen wird. Latin: vescentibus. Apology: his qui sacramentum accipiunt.

is the object of their abuse is specifically declared to be, not bread and wine, either in themselves or as symbols, but the body and blood of Christ. That which they are treating with contumely is said to be the body of the Lord, and their crime is, that they do not discern it, "not discerning the body of the Lord." But unbelief would be its own safeguard, if it were the communicant's faith, and not the will and institution of Christ, which was the ground of the presence. The unbeliever could say: 'As I have no faith, there is no body of Christ to discern; there is no body and blood of which I can be guilty.' Of such men, moreover, the Apostle, in the previous chapter, declared, that the broken bread and the cup of blessing are to them also the communion of the body and blood of Christ.

Let any man weigh solemnly the import of the thought: He that eateth unworthily of this bread is guilty of the body of the Lord; he that drinketh unworthily of this cup is guilty of the blood of the Lord; and then let him ask himself, before the Searcher of hearts, whether he dare resolve the Lord's Supper into a mere eating of a symbol of Christ's body, the drinking of a symbol of Christ's blood? Let it be remembered, that, in the case of the Corinthians, deeply as they had sinned, there was no designed dishonor of the sacramental elements, still less of Christ, whom they set forth, there was no hatred to Christ, no positive infidelity, and yet an unworthy drinking of the sacramental cup made them "*guilty of the blood of Christ.*" The Apostle expressly tells us, too, whereon the fearfulness of their guilt and the terribleness of their penalty turned: "They ate and drank damnation to themselves, *not discerning* (making no difference of) *the Lord's body.*" But on all the rationalistic interpretations there is no body of the Lord there to discern.

To "discern" (diakrinein) elsewhere translated to "make or put differences between," involves a correct mental and moral judgment; it means to distinguish between two things which there is a liability of confounding, to mark the distinction between one thing and another. "Can I *discern* between good and evil?" "That I may discern between good and bad." "Cause them to discern between clean and unclean," that is

to mark and make the distinction, in mind, feeling, and act. To "discern the body of the Lord," is therefore to discriminate between it, and something which is, or might be confounded with it, to mark its difference from some other thing, to believe, feel, and act in the conviction, that it is not that other thing, but is the body of the Lord. The point is, That which you receive in the Lord's Supper is not mere bread and wine, as your conduct would imply that it is, but is also the body and blood of Christ, therefore, your guilt (taking its root in a failure to discern this body and blood) is not that of the abuse of bread and wine, but of the indignity offered to His body and blood which they communicate; therefore your punishment is not simply that of men guilty of gluttony and drunkenness, but that of men guilty of a wrong done to the body and blood of Christ; therefore sickness and death have been sent to warn you of your awful crime, and if these warnings be not heeded, your final doom will be to perish with the world (v. 32).

The *sacramental* communion was ordained of Christ as the means of the *spiritual* communion. In its divine essence, that is, in its sacramental character the Lord's Supper is unchangeable, but its *effects* and *blessings* are conditioned upon the faith of the recipient. The same sunlight falls upon the eye of the blind and of the seeing alike; both eyes alike *receive* it, but the eye of the seeing alone *perceives* it; it is communicated to both, it is, "discerned" by but the one. But the analogy fails at an important point: In spirituals the lack of the perception with the reception is voluntary, and, therefore, while the blind eye suffers privation only, the blind soul comes under condemnation. It is the blind man's *misfortune* that he does not see, it is the unbelieving man's *guilt* that he does not *discern*. The diseased and the sound eat of the same natural bread; but to one it brings strength, to another it is without effect and to yet another it brings nausea and agony. The difference of result is owing to the difference of condition in the recipient. The Holy Spirit breathes forever on and in the word, and is, with it, received by all who hear the word, quickening the yielding heart, and hardening the heart which resists Him.

Jesus said to every one of the disciples present, probably to Judas, who betrayed, certainly to Peter, who soon after denied Him: "Take, eat, This is My body given for you;" and the ministers of Christ for eighteen centuries have said to every communicant, believing or unbelieving, "Take, eat, This is the body of Christ given for you," and what Christ said, and they say, is unchangingly true. So far there is no distinction made by the character of the recipient, for as much as this depended upon Christ's will, and is therefore unchanging. "The gifts of God are without repentance," that is, there is no vacillation, repentance, or fluctuation of mind in God. But when to these absolute words is added: "*Do* this in remembrance of me," there comes, in something dependent upon man's will, and which may, therefore, fluctuate. As it is true, even of the man that perishes, that Christ's body was broken and His blood shed for him, "for our Lord Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for *every man;*" as it is true that every man in the Resurrection shall be called forth from the grave, for "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive," though some shall rise to glory, and others to shame; so is it true that every man, however unworthy, sacramentally partakes of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, though it be to his own condemnation. As the unbelieving, under the Old Dispensation, were equally with the believing outwardly sprinkled with the blood of the covenant, though they received not, for lack of faith, its blessings; as those who are unbelieving and baptized receive the baptism itself in its sacramental entireness, though they do not appropriate its blessings, so do the communicants in the Holy Supper confirm the testimony, that, although unbelief shuts us out from the blessings of the promises and ordinances, we cannot thereby make them of none effect. Our faith does not make and our unbelief cannot unmake them. The same objective reality is in every case presented, and in every case it is one and the same thing, whose benefits faith appropriates, and unbelief rejects.

That Judas was at the Supper of the Lord seems highly probable. Matthew and Mark, after telling us that our Lord

"sat down with the *twelve*," describe the Institution of the Supper without giving a hint of the departure of Judas. Luke, who proposed to write "in order," and who is generally regarded as most precise in his chronology, in direct connection with the words of the Supper, immediately *after* them, tells us our Lord said: "But, behold! the hand of him that betrayeth Me is with Me on the table." (Luke xxii. 21.) The force of the word "immediately," in John xiii. 30, is not such as to exclude the possibility of what Luke seems so distinctly to assert, and what the two other synoptical evangelists more than imply, to wit, that Judas was present at the Lord's Supper, and such is the judgment of the oldest and best commentators, and, among them, of Calvin himself, and of others, who, in common with him, had a doctrinal interest in denying the presence of Judas. Moreover, as John does not give an account of the Institution of the Supper, we may naturally settle the chronological and other questions connected with it from the synoptists. But if our Lord could say to Judas also, "Take, eat, This is My body," then the sacramental character of the Supper cannot depend upon the worthiness or faith of the receiver.

In all divine provisions for the salvation of man, we must discriminate between the *essence*, which is of God, and is, like Him, unchanging, and the *use* of them, which is by man, and is conditioned on his faith. The divine reality is neither affected by the character of the giver nor of the receiver, as a gold coin does not cease to be gold, though the giver hands it away carelessly as a piece of brass, and the receiver takes it as brass and casts it into the mire. Faith is not a Philosopher's Stone; it cannot convert lead into gold; it can only grasp what is. Nor can unbelief by a reverse process convert gold into lead; it can only reject what is. "Unto *us* was the *gospel* preached, as well as unto *them*; but the word preached did not *profit* them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." The gospel, the word, the sacrament, remain one and the same, but the *profit* connected with them depends upon the faith of those that receive them.

God is not far from any one of us, yet none but the believing realize the benefits of His presence. The multitude thronged and pressed upon Jesus; His presence was equally real in its *essence* to all, but the saving efficacy of it went forth in virtue only to the woman who touched His clothes in faith. (Mark v. 30.) So Christ is present in the sacramental drapery, alike to all communicants, but the touch of faith is needed to participate in the virtue of His healing. The touch of those who crucified our Lord was no less real than that of the woman whose touch brought healing; but their touch, like the unworthy eating and drinking, made them "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." And as no indignity which they could offer to the raiment of our Lord could make them guilty of His body and blood, so may we reason, that no indignity offered to bread and wine, even if they were the sacramental medium of the body and blood of Christ, and still less if they were but bread and wine, could make those who offered it guilty of the body and blood of Christ. The truth is, that the terms in which the guilt of the unworthy communicants is characterized, and the fearful penalties with which it was visited, to wit, temporal judgments, even unto death, and eternal condemnation with the world, if the sin was not repented of, make it inconceivable that the objective element in the Lord's Supper is bread and wine merely; but if the body and blood be there objectively, then must they be received sacramentally by all communicants. If it be said Christ cannot be substantially present to unworthy communicants according to His human nature, otherwise they must derive benefit from it, it might be correctly replied, neither can He be substantially present with them according to His divine nature, otherwise they must derive benefit from that; but the latter is conceded by the objector, therefore he must concede that his argument is of no weight against the possibility of the former. Christ is a Saviour, but He is also a judge.

But if it be granted that the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper is one which is fixed, absolute, and unchanging, then must it be substantial, and not imaginary; not

a thing of our minds, but of His wonderful person, not ideal, but true; faith does not make it, but finds it, unto life; unbelief does not unmake it, but, to its own condemnation, fails to discern it. The sacramental presence is fathomless, like the Incarnation; like it, also, it is in the sphere of supernatural reality, to which the natural is as the shadow. The presence of the communicant at the Supper belongs to a lower sphere of actuality than the presence of the undivided Christ in it; and the outward taking and eating is the divinely appointed means whereby the ineffable mystery of the communion of Christ's body and blood is consummated, a communion heavenly and spiritual in its manner over against all that is earthly and fleshly; but in its essence more true than all earthly truth, more real than all earthly reality, more substantial than all earthly substance. The body and blood of Christ are more truly present in the Supper than are the bread and wine, because their sphere of presence is divine; the bread and wine are but the gifts of the hand of God, the body and blood of Christ are inseparable constituents of God's incarnate person.

The Non-Lutheran interpreters have made concessions of great importance in their interpretation of these texts. GUALTHER, one of the greatest of the Zurich divines (d. 1586) says: "Shall be held guilty of the same crime with Judas who betrayed Christ, with the Jews and soldiers who scourged Him, spit upon Him, wounded, crucified Him, and shed His blood."

PAREUS: Heidelberg (d. 1622): "Judas betrayed, the Jews condemned, the soldiers pierced Christ's body and shed His blood upon the Cross. They who abuse the sacrament are absolutely partakers in their crime, (*sceleri prorsus communicant*)."

SEBASTIAN MEYER, of Berne: "They commit murder (*cædem committere*) and shed the Redeemer's blood," "incur the dreadful crime of parricide."

One more proposition remains to be touched, but it is negative in its character, and in this article we have proposed to confine ourselves to the positive and thetical. Here, therefore, we reach the end of our exhibition of the positive propositions

in which our great Confession sets forth the faith of our Church. We have the five simple propositions which are yielded by the analysis of the Tenth Article. We have viewed them purely as Scriptural questions. We have treated them very much as independent propositions, establishing each on special evidence of its own. But, while the argument for the faith of our Church is so strong on each head as well as on the whole as to bear even this severe process, it should not be forgotten that none of these are, in fact, isolated. They cling together with all the internal coherence of divine truth. The truth of any one of them implies the truth of all of them. If we have failed in establishing four separately, yet have succeeded in establishing one, then have we in establishing that established the five.

The sense of the words of the Institution which our Church confesses, which is derived from the words themselves, is sustained by every Scripture allusion to them. Not only is there not the faintest hint anywhere that they are figurative, but every fresh allusion to them gives new evidence that they are to be taken as they sound. If the *offering* of the ancient sacrifices pointed to a true offering of Christ, the eating of the sacrifices necessarily points to a true, though supernatural, communion of the body and blood which He offered. If the slaying of the Paschal Lamb pointed to the slaying of Christ's body, the sacramental reception of the body of the Lamb of God must be a part of the New Testament Passover; the Lord's Supper cannot substitute an unreality for a reality, but must substitute a higher reality for a lower one. If Moses meant what he said when he declared, as he sprinkled the book and the people: "This is the blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined unto you," (Heb. ix. 20,) then must our Lord be accepted at His word, when, with the covenanting terms of the Old Testament, the Testament of Moses, so clearly in his eye, and meaning to mark the New Testament antithesis, He says: "This is *My* blood, of the New Testament." Every Scripture declaration in regard to the Supper of the Lord points, with an unvarying tendency, to the great result which is treasured in the faith of our Church.

When we ask, What *is* it which Christ tells us to, Take, eat? he replies, This is My body, not This is a sign of My body. When we ask, What does the bread communicate? St. Paul replies, The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? not the communion of the sign of His body. When we ask, What is he guilty of who eats and drinks unworthily? the answer is, He is guilty of the body and blood of Christ, not of the sign of the body or sign of the blood. When we ask, How did the unworthy communicant come to incur this guilt? what did he fail to discern? the reply is, Not discerning the Lord's body, not that he failed to discern the sign or symbol of Christ's body. We cannot tear from its place the sacramental doctrine of our Church, without tearing up the whole Evangelical system. The principles of interpretation which relieve us of the Eucharistic mystery take from us the mystery of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement. We cannot remove Christ from the Supper and consistently leave Him anywhere else, and we can take no part of Christ from the Supper without taking away the whole. The very foundations of our faith give way under the processes which empty the Lord's Supper of its divine glory. The Sacramental Presence is the necessary sequel, the crowning glory of the Incarnation and Atonement; and the illumination of the Holy Spirit in the word which enables the eye of Faith to see God in the body, and redemption in the blood enables it to see the body in the bread, and the blood in the cup, not after the manner of the first man, who is of the earth, earthy, but after the manner of the second Man, who is the Lord from heaven.

III.—*Summary View of the Lutheran Doctrine of the Sacramental Presence of Christ, on three Points.*

1. *Modes of Presence.*

The Lutheran Church believes on the sure warrant of God's word, that the body of our Lord Jesus remains a true human body, and as to its natural and determinate presence has been removed from earth, and is in the glory of the world of angels and the redeemed. She also believes that in and through the

divine nature with which it forms one person, it is present on earth in another sense, no less true than the former. She believes that the sacramental elements are divinely appointed through the power of the Saviour's own benediction, as the medium through which we participate after a spiritual, supernatural, heavenly, substantial, objective, and true manner, "in the communion of His body and of His blood." (1 Cor. x. 16.) Our Church never has denied that the ascension of Christ was real, literal, and local; never has denied that His body has a determinate presence in heaven; never has maintained that it has a local presence on earth. Neither does she impute to Him two bodies, one present and one absent, one natural and the other glorified, but she maintains that one body, forever a natural and true body as to its essence, but no longer in its natural or earthly condition, but glorified, is absent indeed in one mode, but present in another. As she believes that God is really one in one respect, and no less really three in another respect, so does she believe that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is really absent in one respect, and just as really present in another. Christ has left us, and He never leaves us—He has gone from us, and He is ever present with us; He has ascended far above all heavens, but it is that He may fill all things. As His divine nature, which in its totality is in heaven, and in its fullness is in Christ bodily, is on earth while it is in heaven, as that divine nature is present with us, without extension or locality, is on earth without leaving heaven, is present in a manner true, substantial and yet incomprehensible, so does it render the body of Christ, which is one person with it, also present. That body in its determinate limitations is in heaven, and in and of itself would be there alone, but *through the divine*, in *consequence of the personal conjunction*, and in virtue of that conjunction, using in the whole person the attributes of the whole person in both its parts, it is rendered present. It is present without extension, for the divine through which it is present is unextended—it is present without locality, for the divine through which it is present is illocal. It is on earth, for the divine is

on earth—it is in heaven, for the divine remains in heaven, and like the divine it is present truly and substantially, yet incomprehensibly.

In other words, as our Church believes that the one essence of God has two modes of presence, one general and ordinary, by which it is present to all creatures, and the other special and extraordinary, by which it is present, so as to constitute one person, after which mode it is present to none other than to the humanity of Jesus Christ, and that both modes of presence, although unlike in their results, are equally substantial; so does she believe that this one humanity taken into personal and inseparable union with this one essence, has two modes of presence, one determinate, in which it is related to space, through its own inherent properties; the other infinite, in which it is related to space in the communion of the divine attributes, and that both modes of presence, though unlike, are equally substantial.

Is it said that to deny that Christ's sacramental presence is local is to deny it altogether; that to affirm that His determinate presence is in the realm of angels and of the glorified, is to affirm that He has no presence at all on earth? Be it said, but then, at least, let the odious libel that our Church teaches consubstantiation, or a physical presence, or a corporeal or carnal mode of presence, be forever dropped. Our Church never has denied that, in the sense and in the manner in which our Lord was once on earth, He is no longer here, but she maintains that the illocal is as real as the local, the supernatural is as true as the natural. "A local absence," as Andreæ said, in his argument with Beza at Montbeillard, "does not prevent a sacramental presence"; the presence of Christ's humanity on earth, through the Deity with which it is one person, is as real as is its presence through the properties of its own essence in heaven. The soundest theologians do not hesitate to declare in propositions which seem contradictory, but are not, "God is everywhere," and "God is nowhere," everywhere in His fathomless omnipresence—nowhere locally or determinately—and as is the presence of the divine, such is the

presence it imparts to the humanity which is personally united with it. The man Christ Jesus is with us after one manner, and He is not with us, after another manner; He is with us through the plenary exercise of His divine majesty, not with us in the local or determinate restrictions of space. "There is no contradiction in attributing contrary things to the same subject, provided they be affirmed in different respects and modes."*

2. *A Living Saviour.*

The current view of un-Lutheran Protestantism practically is, that all we need for our redemption is a *dead Christ.* We are to look back to Calvary to find peace in thinking of what was there done, and at the Lord's Supper we are to look back to the sacrifice once made for our sins. The current view excludes the necessity of a living Saviour in our redemption. According to it, we redeem ourselves, or the Spirit of God redeems us, by what Christ once did, and without any personal work on His part now. To the theology of a large part of the Church it would be no disturbing element if the divine nature of Christ had been separated from the human after the resurrection. Instead of a robust and mighty faith which hangs upon a living Saviour, and lives by His life, we have a religion of sentiment verging away into sentimentality, a religion which lives by its own thoughts about a Saviour of bygone times. We have had in our hands a book on the Lord's Supper by an American preacher, the frontispiece of which represents a lonely tombstone, and on it the words: "To the memory of my Saviour." Nothing could more sadly, yet vigorously, epitomize the tendency of which we speak—the graveyard tendency, which turns the great festival of redemption into a time of mourning, and coldly furnishes forth the marriage tables with the baked meats of the funeral. Now the glory of the Lutheran system in all its parts, and especially in its doctrine of the Lord's Supper is, that it accepts in all its fullness the Apostle's argument: "If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to

* Chemnitz, De duab. Naturis, 179.

God by the death of His Son, MUCH MORE, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His LIFE." Never, indeed, has the human heart been so taught as by our system in its purity to turn to the death of Christ for hope; but our Church has been led by the Holy Spirit too deeply into all the fullness of truth to make an antagonism between the death of her Saviour and His life.

If Christ must die to make our redemption, He must live to apply it. If the Lord's Supper is a sacrament of the redemption made by His death, it is also a sacrament of the same redemption applied by His life. If it tells us that His body and blood were necessary to make our redemption, it tells us also that they are still necessary to apply the redemption they then made. He made the sacrifice once for all—he applies it constantly. We live by Him, we must hang on Him—the vine does not send up one gush of its noble sap and then remain inert. It receives the totality of life, once for all, but the sap which sustains it must flow on—its one, unchanging and abiding life puts itself forth into the new offshoots, and by constant application of itself maintains the old branches. If the sap-life ceases, the seed-life cannot save. Cut the branch off, and the memory of the life will not keep it from withering; it must have the life itself—and this it must derive successively from the vine. It could not exist without the original life of the vine, nor can it exist without the present life of the vine, be its past what it may. Faith cannot feed on itself, as many seem to imagine it can—it must have its object. The ordinances, the Word, and the sacraments give to it that by which it lives. Faith in the nutritious power of bread does not nourish—the bread itself is necessary.

3. *The Propitiation and the Sacramental Presence.*

The man who feels a moral repugnance to the Scripture doctrine of the Eucharist, will find, if he analyzes his feelings thoroughly, that they take their root in a repugnance to the doctrine of the atonement by Christ's body and blood. The man who asks what use is there in a sacramental application of

them in the Lord's Supper, really asks, what use was there in a redemptory offering of them on Calvary. He may be using the terms of Scripture, but if he takes his inmost thoughts before his God, he will probably find that he has been denying the true vicarious character of the sacrifice of our Lord—that he has fallen into that conception of the sacrifice on Calvary which is essentially Socinian, for everything which brings down the oblation of the Son of God into the sphere of the natural *is* essentially Socinian. He will find that in his view his Lord is only a glorious martyr, or that the power of His sacrifice is only a moral power; that the cross is but a powerful sermon, and that those awful words, which in their natural import unbare, as it is nowhere else unbared, the heart of Deity in the struggle of its unspeakable love and fathomless purpose; that all these are oriental poesy—figures of speech—graces of language. The theory of the atonement, which pretends to *explain* it, is rotten at the core. The atonement, in its whole conception, belongs to a world which man cannot now enter. The blessings and adaptations of it we can comprehend in some measure. We can approach them with tender hearts full of gratitude; but the *essence* of the atonement we can understand as little as we understand the essence of God.

If Christ, through His body broken, made remission of sins, why do we ask, to what end is the doctrine, that the same body through which He made the remission is that through which He applies it? His body *as such* could make no remission of sins, but, through the Eternal Spirit, with which it was conjoined in personal unity, it made redemption—His body *as such*, may have no power to apply the redemption or to be with the redeemed, but, through the same relation by which it entered into the sphere of the supernatural to make redemption, it reveals itself now in that same sphere to apply it. All theology without exception, has had views of the atonement which were lower or higher, as its views of the Lord's Supper were low or high. Men have talked and written as if the doctrine of our Church on this point were a stupid blunder, forced upon it by the self-will and obstinacy of one man. The truth is, that this

doctrine clearly revealed in the New Testament, clearly confessed by the early Church, lies at the very heart of the Evangelical system—Christ is the centre of the system, and in the Supper is the centre of Christ's revelation of Himself. The glory and mystery of the incarnation combine there as they combine nowhere else. Communion with Christ is that by which we live, and the supper is "*the* Communion." Had Luther abandoned this vital doctrine, the Evangelical Church would have abandoned him. He did not make this doctrine, next in its immeasurable importance to that of justification by faith, with which it indissolubly coheres,—the doctrine made him. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the most vital and practical in the whole range of the profoundest Christian life—the doctrine which, beyond all others, conditions and vitalizes that life, for in it the character of faith is determined, invigorated and purified as it is nowhere else. It is not only a fundamental doctrine, but is among the most fundamental of fundamentals.

We know what we have written. We know, that to take our Saviour at His word here, to receive the teachings of the New Testament in their obvious intent, is to incur with some a reproach little less bitter than if we had taken up arms against the holiest truths of our faith. We are willing to endure it. Our fathers were willing to shed their blood for the truth, and shall we refuse to incur a little obloquy? The fact that we bear the name of a Church which stood firm when rationalizing tendencies directed themselves with all their fury against this doctrine of the Word of God, increases our responsibility. When at a later and sadder period, she yielded to subtlety what she had maintained successfully against force, and let her doctrine fall, she fell with it. When God lifted her from the dust He lifted her banner with it, and on that banner, as before, the star of a pure Eucharistic faith shone out amid the lurid clouds of her new warfare, and there it shall shine forever. Our Saviour has spoken, His Church has spoken. His testimony is explicit, as is hers. The Lutheran Church has suffered more for her adherence to this doctrine than from all other causes,

but the doctrine itself repays her for all her suffering. To her it is a very small thing that she should be judged of man's judgment, but there is one judgment she will not, she dare not hazard, the judgment of her God which they eat and drink to themselves, who will not discern the Lord's body in the Supper of the Lord.

We do not wish to be misunderstood in what we have said as to the *moral* repugnance to our doctrine of the supper. We distinguish between a mere intellectual difficulty, and an aversion of the affections. How New Testament-like, how Lutheran have sounded the sacramental hymns and devotional breathings of men whose theory of the Lord's Supper embodied little of its divine glory. The glow of their hearts melted the frostwork of their heads.

When they treat of sacramental communion, and of the mystical union, they give evidence, that, with their deep faith in the atonement, there is connected, in spite of the rationalizing tendency which inheres in their system, a hearty acknowledgment of the supernatural and incomprehensible character of the Lord's Supper. On the other hand the evidence is overwhelming, that, as low views of the Lord's Supper prevail, in that proportion the doctrine of the atonement exhibits a rationalizing tendency. We repeat the proposition confirmed by the whole history of the Church, that a moral repugnance to the doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are the medium through which redemption is *applied*, has its root in a moral repugnance to the doctrine that His precious body and blood are the medium through which redemption was *wrought*.

IV.—The Logic of the Exegesis sustained by its History. The Testimony of the Ancient Church. *

It is now admitted by dispassionate Scholars, who are not Lutheran in their convictions, first that the Zwinglian doctrine was unknown in the most Ancient Church. Second: that the

---

* Albertinus: De Eucharistiæ Sacram. Libri tres. Sec. ex Patribus. Dav. 1654. Folio. Still the greatest of the defences of the Calvinistic view.

Bellarminus: De Controv. Chr. Fidei. Paris. 1620. Folio. De Euchar. Lib. II.

doctrine of our Church in regard to the Lord's Supper, was certainly the doctrine of the fathers in the Church Catholic, from the Fourth to the Ninth Century, the second theological age, the golden, or as it is called the classic age of Christian antiquity, to wit: that "the presence of the Lord in the Eucharist" is "real, according to substance, is, with and under the species," (Marheinecke). The first age, from the Apostolic writings to the end of the third, is we believe no less decided in its unity on the same doctrine. To this conviction the studies

---

Chap. I. xxxix., Testimon. Patrum. The greatest single piece of Polemic in defence of the Church of Rome.

CLAUDE: The Catholick Doctrine of the Eucharist in all ages (in answer to Arnaud) touching the belief of the Greek, Moscovite, Armenian, Jacobite, Nestorian, Coptic, Maronite, and other Eastern Churches. From the French. London, 1683, Folio. (Calvinistic).

COSIN: The History of Popish Transubstantiation to which is premised and opposed the Catholick Doctrine of . . . the Ancient Fathers. London, 1676, 8vo. (Vigorously Anti-Romish in its negations, and decidedly Lutheranizing in its affirmation.)

EUCHARIST: A full view of the Doctrine and practice of the Ancient Church relating to London. 1668, 4to. (Calvinistic).

FABER, G. S.: Christ's Discourse at Capernaum, fatal to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. London, 1840. 8vo. (Copious Patristic Citation.)

GOODE. WM.: Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist: 2 vols. 8vo. London. 1856, Chap. v. The Testimony of the Fathers. (A tissue of partizan falsification. Anglican Low Church).

HOSPINIAN: Histor. Sacramentariæ Pars Prior. Exp. Coen. Domin. in primitivo et Veter. Eccles. Genev. 1681, Folio.

MARHEINECKE: Sanct. Patrum de Praes. Chr. in Coen. Dom. Senten. Triplex. Heid. 1811. 4to.

MELANCHTHON: Sententiæ veterum aliquot Scriptorum de Coena Domini. (1530). Corpus Reformat. xxiii. 727—753.

OECOLAMPADIUS: De Genuina verb. Dom. juxta vetustissimos auctores expositione Bas. 1525, 8vo. Quid de Eucharistia veter. tam Graeci, tum Latini senserunt. Dialogus. (1530) in Oecolampad., et Zwingli Epistola. Lib. iii.

PUSEY, E. B.: The doctrine of the Real Presence, as contained in the Fathers from the death of S. John the Evangelist, to the Fourth General Council vindicated. Oxford and London. 1855, 8vo.

WATERLAND: Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and antiquity. Oxford, 1868. 8vo. (abundant patristic citation).

The recent German works which present more or less copiously the patristic history of the doctrine are: 1, Doctrines and History: Ebrard, 1845; Kahnis, 1851; Rückert, 1856; 2, History: Döllinger, 1826; Engelhardt, (Ztschr. für histor. theol. 1842. Steiz, Jahrb. f. dtsche Theol. 1864–65. Meier, 1842. Baur, Tertullian, Doctr). Tüb. Ztschr. 1839.2. See Kahnis Dogm. ii. 182. 2. Luthardt Dogm. § 74.

of the greatest of the English patristic scholars of our age has led him. His testimony given as the final result of years of close investigation has probably as great weight as human testimony is capable of having on a point of this kind. Of his vast patristic scholarship, there is no dispute. Of his great personal purity there is no question. Reared in a Church which confesses the Calvinistic view of the Supper, his education was adverse to the perception of the force of testimony sustaining the Lutheran view. If he be charged with Romanizing views, in some part of his theological thinking, it may heighten the value of his testimony here, where he maintains the Catholicity of the Lutheran view, over against the Romish corruption in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the force of the whole is heightened by his unconcealed aversion in many respects to the Lutheran Church. We mean, as the reader has already anticipated, Dr. Pusey. In his vindication of the doctrine of the Real Presence, as contained in the Fathers from the death of St. John the Evangelist, to the Fourth General Council, he demonstrates that "the belief that the elements remain after consecration in their natural substance was not supposed of old to involve any tenet of consubstantiation:" that, "Consubstantiation was not held by the Lutheran body:" which he demonstrates from the symbols of the Lutheran Church, and from Luther himself. By a most patient examination of evidence, which he cites in full, he shows upon the one hand that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is no doctrine of the Earliest Church, and that the doctrine of a true objective presence of the body and blood of Christ, and under the bread and wine, is its doctrine. No better summary of his labors, and of the conviction they strengthen in his mind can be given than that with which he closes his book:

"I have now gone through every writer who in his extant works speaks of the Holy Eucharist, from the time when St. John the Evangelist was translated to his Lord, to the dates of the Fourth General Council, A. D. 451, a period of three centuries and a half. I have suppressed nothing; I have not knowingly omitted anything; I have given every passage, as

far as in me lay, with so much of the context, as was necessary for the clear exhibition of its meaning. Of course, in writers of whom we have such large remains, as S. Augustine and S. Chrysostom, or in some with whom I am less familiar, I may have overlooked particular passages. Yet the extracts are already so large, so clear, and so certain, that any additional evidence could only have coincided with what has been already produced. Albertinus did his utmost on the Calvinistic side. His strength lies in his arguments against a physical doctrine of Transubstantiation; his weakness, in the paradox which he strangely maintains, that the Fathers did not believe a real Objective Presence. In so doing, he treats the Fathers, as others of his school have treated Holy Scripture on the other Sacrament. When his school would disparage the doctrine of Baptism, they select passages from Holy Scripture, in which it is not speaking of that Sacrament. In like way Albertinus gains the appearance of citing the Fathers on the orthodox side (as he calls it), i. e., the disbelief of the Real Presence, by quoting them when they are not speaking of the Holy Eucharist, but, e. g., of the Presence of our Lord's Human Nature in Heaven, or the absence of His Visible Presence upon earth; of the natural properties of bodies; or of spiritual, as distinct from sacramental Communion, or of the Eucharistic and outward Symbols, under which the Sacramental Presence is conveyed. Supported, as he thinks, by these, he proceeds to explain away, as he best may, the clear and distinct passages which had hitherto been alleged from the Fathers, in proof of the Doctrine of the Real Presence. Yet the very diligence of Albertinus on the one side, or of Roman Catholic controversialists on the other, obviously gives the more security, that nothing can have been overlooked, which could seem to support either side.

In the present collection, I have adduced the Fathers, not as original authorities, but as witnesses to the meaning of Holy Scripture. I have alleged them on the old, although now, on both sides, neglected rule, that what was taught "every where, at all times, by all," must have been taught to the whole

Church by the inspired Apostles themselves. The Apostles planted; they watered, they appointed others to take their ministry, to teach as they had themselves taught from God. A universal suppression of the truths which the Apostles taught and the unmarked substitution of falsehood, is a theory which contradicts human reason, no less than it does our Lord's promise to His Church. There is no room here for any alleged corruption. The earliest Fathers, S. Ignatius, S. Justin Martyr, S. Ireneus, S. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, or S. Hippolytus, state the doctrine of the Real Presence as distinctly as any later father.

And now, reader, if you have got thus far, review for a moment, from what variety of minds, as of countries, this evidence is collected. Minds the most simple and the most philosophical; the female martyrs of Persia, or what are known as the philosophic fathers; minds wholly practical, as Tertullian or S. Cyprian, S. Firmilian, S. Pacian, or S. Julius; or those boldly imaginative, as Origen; or poetic minds, as S. Ephrem or S. Isaac or S. Paulinus; fathers who most use a figurative and typical interpretation of the Old Testament, as S. Ambrose, or such as, like S. Chrysostom, from their practical character, and the exigencies of the churches in which they preached, confined themselves the most scrupulously to the letter; mystical writers, as S. Macarius, or ascetics, as Mark, the Hermit, or Apollos, or the Abbot Esaias; writers in other respects opposed to each other; the friends of Origen, as S. Didymus, or his opponents, as Theophilus of Alexandria and S. Epiphanius; or again, S. Cyril of Alexandria or Theodoret; heretics or defenders of the faith, as Eusebius and Theodorus, Hereacleotes, Arius, or S. Athanasius; Apollinarius or S. Chrysostom, who wrote against him, Nestorius or S. Cyril of Alexandria—all agree in one consentient exposition of our Lord's words, "This is My body, this is My blood." Whence this harmony, but that one spirit attuned all the various minds in the one body into one; so that the very heretics were slow herein to depart from it?

There is a difference ofttimes in the setting, so to speak, of

the one jewel truth. We may meet with that truth where *we* should not have expected it; some may even be deterred, here and there, by the mystical interpretations of Holy Scripture, amid which they find it. That mystical interpretation is no matter of faith. But a mode of interpretation which presupposes any object of belief to be alluded to, when scarce anything is mentioned which may recall it to the mind, shows at least how deeply that belief is stamped upon the soul. It is a common saying, how "Bishop Horne found our Lord Jesus Christ everywhere in the Psalms, Grotius nowhere." Certainly our Lord must have been much in Bishop Horne's heart, that everything in the Psalms spoke to his soul of Him. So much the more then, must, our Lord's gift of His body and blood have been in the hearts of the early fathers, that words which would not suggest the thought of them to others, spoke it to them.

But however different the occasions may be upon which the truth is spoken of, in whatever variety of ways it may be mentioned, the truth itself is one and the same—one uniform, simple, consentient truth; that what is consecrated upon the altars for us to receive, what, under the outward elements is there present for us to receive, is the body and blood of Christ; by receiving which the faithful in the Lord's Supper do verily and indeed take and receive the body and blood of Christ; by presuming to approach which, the wicked (*i. e.* those who with impenitent hearts wilfully purpose to persevere in deadly sin, and yet venture to "take the sacrament") become guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; *i. e.* become guilty of a guilt like theirs who laid hands on His divine person while yet in the flesh among us, or who shed His all-holy blood.

Now, we have been accustomed to value Ante-Nicene Testimonies to the divinity of our Lord; we are struck when S. Cyprian (while deciding as to the baptism of infants on the eighth day) lays down the doctrine of the transmission of original sin as clearly as S. Augustine amid the Pelagian controversy.

Yet the principle of these questions is one and the same.

The argument is valid for all or for none. Either it is of no use to show that Christians, before the Council of Nice, did uniformly believe in the divinity of our Lord, as the Church has since; or it *is* a confirmation of the faith, that they did receive unhesitatingly in their literal sense our blessed Lord's words: "This is My body."

This argument from the consent of those who had handed down the truth before them, was employed as soon as there were authorities which could be alleged. So rooted was the persuasion, that certain truth must have been known to those who received the faith from the first, that even heretics resorted to the argument, and garbled and misrepresented the fathers before them, in order to bring them to some seeming agreement with themselves. The argument was used by minds in other respects of a different mould. Theodoret and S. Leo appended to works on controversial points of faith citations from the fathers before them. S. Augustine vindicated against Pelagius, and S. Athanasius against Arius, authorities which they had misrepresented. Even the fathers, assembled from the whole world in general councils, have, in proof of their decisions, wherein all were agreed, alleged the authorities of yet older fathers, who were known in previous ages to have handed down the Apostolic truth.

Yes, along the whole course of time, throughout the whole circuit of the Christian world, from east to west, from north to south, there floated up to Christ our Lord one harmony of praise. Unbroken as yet lived on the miracle of the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit from on high swept over the discordant strings of human tongues and thoughts, of hearts and creeds, and blended all their varying notes into one holy unison of truth. From Syria and Palestine and Armenia, from Asia Minor and Greece, from Thrace and Italy, from Gaul and Spain, from Africa Proper and Egypt and Arabia and the Isles of the Sea, wherever any Apostle had taught, wherever any martyr had sealed with his blood the testimony of Jesus, from the polished cities or the anchorites of the desert, one Eucharistic voice ascended: "Righteous art Thou, O Lord, and all Thy words are

truth." Thou hast said, "This is My body, this is My blood." Hast Thou said, and shalt not Thou do it? As Thou hast said, so we believe.

Truly, O Lord, "Thy holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee."

ART. II.—SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL SCIENCE.

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, PROFESSOR IN FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

THE subject of socialism is an extensive, as well as a profound one, and we can speak of it here only under its more general aspects. This can be best done, we think, by taking a brief survey of the socialistic movements of the past, pointing out their actual end or aim, and then showing the possibility, necessity and importance of what may be properly denominated social science.

Socialism is as old as society itself; for no sooner is society organized than a sense of its evils and imperfections is awakened, and reflection becomes active to devise some means by which they may be removed. The evils in the social organism are not only patent to the eye, but are far spread and deeply felt. Physical distress is produced by the unequal distribution of wealth; pride, selfishness and egotism are cherished by one class of society: envy, jealousy, hatred, suspicion, or despair and despondency, by the other. Such antagonistic elements necessarily must frequently come into collision, and the result is the long-continued oppression of the weaker class by the stronger and more powerful. Such a state of things ought, if possible, to be remedied. Plato attempted to do it by an abstract dream or theory. He constructed an ideal state of society, which notwithstanding its faults, has been the admiration of

all succeeding times. Among other things, he regards the possession of private property as the source of all the evils in the state, of avarice, haughtiness, and meanness. Hence he allows property only to the lower classes of citizens, who have no part whatever in the government. The ruling classes, civilians and warriors, must submit to a community of goods and of wives, since the possession of any private property or even of a separate family, is incompatible with a philosophical ideal of perfection and true patriotism. This is a single specimen of ancient theoretical socialism; but it was by no means something isolated or separated from history or the spirit of the times. It is the representative of a wide-spread and deeply-rooted sentiment in the ancient world, extending from India in the East to the extreme West. All heathenism is essentially dualistic, and unable to reconcile the contradiction between the divine and the human, between matter and spirit! It places this antagonism in man, and regards the soul as essentially good, the body or matter as essentially evil. Hence the highest virtue consists in the ascetic mortification of all sensual and natural appetites. This principle enters into, and gives life to all the old forms of socialism. The gymnosophists of India, who regarded it as a merit to live naked in the woods, and the Pythagoreans, before the time of Plato, whose social organization was based on a community of goods, the Jewish Therapeutæ in Egypt, the Essenes on the shores of the Dead Sea, and other communistic societies, all derived their vitality essentially from the same source, a mistaken idea that matter was the seat of evil, and that felicity could be secured by waging war against it and thus attaining to a state of pure spirituality. Christianity, as we shall see, introduced a new and healthful principle of social reform into the world, but it did not drive out at once the old leaven of heathenism, nor has it done so even up to the present day. The old dualism, or antagonism between matter and spirit remained, and gave rise to the sect of Manicheans, whose principle of reform extended far and wide, beyond the professed disciples of Mani. The Church itself, whilst it always and firmly held the doctrine of the Incarnation, which is the effica-

cious cure for all Manichean and Gnostic errors, and sought to encourage a true Christian asceticism, suffered the old heathen asceticism more or less to intrude itself within its pale. The scriptural antithesis of spirit and flesh, of the kingdom of God and of the world, was confounded at an early period with the ancient antagonism of spirit and matter; and passages of Scripture were employed to serve an asceticism, which virtually turns the body of man into a creature of the devil. Hence the spread of extravagant views concerning the special meritoriousness of self-mortification, of celibacy; and hence the system of external holiness, which has for its aim the complete annihilation of all sensuous appetites, and an absolute flight from the world, as it appears often in the fanatical desire for martyrdom, in monasticism, and the ascetic communism connected with it. The old anchorets in the Egyptian deserts in the fourth century, who sought by poverty and self-mortification their own individual perfection, inaugurated this movement on Christian ground, from a pious Christian motive, with St. Anthony as their leader. About the same time, a wild, erratic and unchristian order arose in Africa, which were much more socialistic than the myriads that gathered around the standard of St. Anthony. The Circumcelliones, as they were called, the first species of mendicant monks, regarded worldly wealth as the root of all evil in the Church; took the part of peasants against the landlords, of the slave against his master, of debtors against their creditors, and carried their fanatical zeal for poverty to such wild excesses, that it was found necessary to suppress them by an imperial edict. Subsequently the wide-spread communistic tendencies of the age became organized in the monastic life, and were placed under the control of the Church. Its aim was, to realize the ideal of ascetic perfection under a social form, through the medium of a communistic organization. It spread with amazing rapidity, both in the East and the West, and excited general admiration throughout the world. Their influence upon society and the world as directed by the Church, was in a dark age in many ways of a most beneficial character; but all these monastic orders and institutions of the mid-

dle ages involved themselves in the flagrant contradiction of commencing in poverty and humility, and ending in extravagance and pride. The very asceticism and moral heroism of their founders gave them reputation and influence; this secured liberal donations, and their growth in wealth was a growth in idleness and dissipation. The Church wisely took these orders under its control and made them subservient to the interests of Christianity; but the tendency, which they represented, could not always be kept within limits, in subjection to the Christian principle. It ran out into various secret orders and combinations, which flourished in darkness and arrayed themselves against both Church and State, the clergy and nobility. Here belong the peasant wars, those popular commotions that ran through the entire middle ages. They started in the spirit and ended in the flesh. They professed to be Christian, but they were in fact political and socialistic in their object and ends. In the 15th century, when strenuous efforts were made within the bosom of the Church to reform itself, an outside heretical opposition spread itself far and wide, and attempted to take into its own hands the reformation of the Church and of human society in general. The "Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit," as they styled themselves, denounced the Church as corrupt, and excited the people against their spiritual leaders; they denied all distinctions, laws and institutions of civil society; and taught that mankind must return to its primitive state in Paradise, that is, to unity with God, which they understood in a pantheistic sense, and to equality among themselves. All government, civil order, private property, marriage, monogamy, the family, they regarded as consequences of sin, which must give way to as complete a community of earthly things, as any dreamed of by modern fanatics. In their efforts to regain the so-called state of Paradise, they preached and carried out in their practice abominable doctrines.

It was the special merit of the Reformation, that it gave a new direction to the general mind of Europe, and turned the religious life from its outward mechanical forms to its proper source in the heart and soul. It thus became a break-water to

the tide of fanaticism, radicalism and licentiousness, which threatened to deluge human society. Had it not been for this barrier providentially set up, the foundations of social order in Church and State probably would have been swept away by the swaying current. It reasserted that the body, matter, or nature is not in itself, evil; that the only evil is sin, which has its seat in the will; and that reformation must proceed from the regeneration of the whole man, and a triumph over egotism as the proper principle of sin. But it was only by degrees, and not without some temporary aberrations that the great moral reformation began to be effected. The wild sect-spirit and politico-religious radicalism of the times received rather an impulse from the boldness of the Reformers in denouncing the corruptions of the times, and broke out in the great Peasant War of the Reformation. "This was political in its origin, although the idea of religious liberty, which it borrowed from the Reformation and misunderstood, attached itself to it and gave it a higher impulse." When this movement had time to disclose its true character, it appeared that it was nothing more than a repetition of what had often occurred before, the old communism, which, straining after and professing a high degree of spirituality, soon toppled over into gross sensuality. As in similar experiments made centuries before, the ruling principle, as proclaimed by Münzer, one of the leaders, was *omnia simul communia*, which implied the destruction of government, of law, of property, of the family, and the most revolting licentiousness.

With the Reformation period the old system of socialism may be said to have come to an end. Its influence on human society resembled that of a tonic; its strained elevation of the spiritual above the material was calculated to preserve the interests of morality against brutish sensualism, and many and imposing were the forms of human character to which it gave rise. Amidst abounding corruption and sensuality, a true Pythagorean, a Platonic, a Stoic, a monk or a hermit, standing up and stemming the tide of iniquity, however vainly, was something respectable certainly, and deserves our admiration in a far higher degree than any other production of antiquity. We

have seen, however, that what promised to the race such celestial flights into the sphere of the spirit, ended in nothing more than a desperate plunge into the depths of a gross and besotted sensuality. This was owing to the fact, that its principle was one-sided; it was purely *theocentric.* Whilst it professed to make supreme account of the divine factor in human progress, it neglected or despised the human, the other factor deeply concerned in every just and legitimate progress of the race.

Modern socialism, involving communism as its necessary attendant and logical consequence, whilst it owes its origin to the same outward causes in society, and produces the same results, differs from those older forms, which we have been considering, in that it does not aim at a complete mastery of the spirit over the flesh by a severe asceticism, but at an emancipation of the flesh from the control of the spirit. It starts in the old dualism; but it proceeds in the inverse order, and either denies the existence of spirit or makes it of subordinate or trifling importance as compared with the claims of the flesh. The ancient system was *theocentric;* the modern is *anthropocentric.* Thus history is made up to a great extent of reactions. The exclusive reign of one idea for a long period of time seems to excite, as it were, a spirit of revenge, and, as if in the way of retaliation, the opposite thought or idea is brought into favor and clothed with power to override and crush its predecessor. Thus socialism for many centuries stood upon one foot and limped, whilst now in our days, as we shall see, it has leapt over and stands on the other. Either position indicates its lameness.

The prophet of modern eudæmonistic anthropocentric humanitarianism is Jean Jacques Rosseau, than whom no author has excited a wider or deeper influence on this age. By a life of sin, lust, and deception, by which he wrought ruin and shame wherever he went, he lost all sense of the spiritual and supernatural; but, with his high intellectual endowments, he felt that he had a higher mission than to wallow in the mire of sensuality. Accordingly he turned philosopher and philanthropist, and, as if in this way he could best cover the infamy of

his private character, he became the great apostle of social reform. His views of education, according to which human nature in itself is essentially good, and only needs training and culture to restore it to a golden age, excited general attention, made an era in the history of education, and gave it an impulse, which is felt down to the present time. His ideal of humanity, divested of religious and moral foundation, together with his theories of human dignity, human rights, human liberty, equality, fraternity and happiness, advocated with great enthusiasm, and clothed in all the splendors of rhetoric, met with an extraordinary response throughout Europe: it carried with it and deceived for the time being some of its noblest minds. The new movement commended itself to all classes of society during the eighteenth century; it was felt to be a needed protest and reaction against the stiff spiritualism and selfish isolation, as manifested in the Church and State, especially in France; and a general enthusiasm prevailed at the advent of these new ideas. Voltaire, and other infidels of the French school, with their negative criticism had done much to pull down the pillars of society, but Rosseau seemed to furnish the world with the necessary positive ideas by which to reconstruct it; hence he had probably more to do in precipitating the French Revolution upon France than any other single man. The first step towards the organization of his humanitarian principle was this awful catastrophe in history in the year 1789. The Revolution was in a great measure socialistic, and gained the adhesion of many good men in its favor in the beginning by the promise it gave of a great social reformation. The occasion of its outbreak was in a great measure the unequal distribution of privileges among the various classes of society and the oppression of the poor. One of the first acts of the Convention, therefore, was the proclamation of the equality of all men. It abolished differences of rank and opened the way of honor to all alike; without however interfering with the right of private property. It abolished the royal power, established a republic, attempted to dethrone God, and substituted human reason in His place. After, however, the storm had spent its force and all the old institu-

tions had been overthrown; after such an outbreak of iniquity as the world had never before witnessed, many and important results inured to society in France. Many abuses were removed, and many obstacles in the progress of society taken out of the way. Privilege was curtailed. Large estates broken up, and the poor and middle classes allowed an opportunity to accumulate property, and to better their condition. The stiff bigotry of the established Church yielded to reason, and free toleration in religion was secured. Outside of France the Revolution has affected more or less the institutions and ideas of all Europe. The overthrow of the old order of things and the development of the new, intensified the desire for social reform, and gave rise to many socialistic theories, especially in France. They all proceed from the humanitarian principle of the equality of all men, and strive to realize it; but they diverge into two tendencies, the *socialistic* and the *communistic*, the former of which still adheres to property, while the latter overthrows all right of this kind; the one is represented by the followers of Count St. Simon and the other by Charles Fourier.

The socialistic tendencies of France have spread to a greater or less extent over Europe, and have had much to do with the late revolutions in Italy and Spain. In England, although socialism in one form or another is coming in like a flood, threatening at no distant day, to wash away its time-honored institutions, its professed advocates are few. The most distinguished among them is Robert Owen, a wealthy manufacturer, and a cotemporary of Fourier. He is a good specimen of anthropocentric eudæmonism, presenting at once its bright and dark sides. He commenced his career by first improving the condition of his own laborers with great liberality and philanthropy, and then attempted to remove the misery of the working classes generally, by a reform of their social condition. For a while he labored for this end by the elevation of the lower classes through means of schools for the poor, the orphan and vagrant children, and enjoyed the sympathy and support of the English people. But the system, based on a false principle, in his case, as in every other case of the same kind, must needs

show its cloven foot. Accordingly, he soon began to attack the Christian religion, the institution of marriage and the family, and declared heaven to be a delusion and earth to be the only end of man ; he thus lost the respect of all sensible people, even before his practical attempt to found a communistic colony in our own country, in the State of Indiana, had proved a failure. In the United States, the socialistic tendencies of the age have embodied themselves in a grand style in Mormonism, a wonderful phenomenon truly, called forth not by a bold theorizer, but still resulting from the humanitarianism of the times, the fruit of that sentiment, which makes mere human nature the starting point of progress.

From this brief, and necessarily imperfect survey of the attempts to solve the social problem in the past, it might appear that there is very little room for faith in anything of the kind. We confess that the prospect is a dreary one, but we have some faith at least, in the ultimate solution of the question. We believe there is here room for *true* science as well as for science *falsely so called*, quite as much so as anywhere else. There is a science of government for nations at large, a science of ethics for individuals, a science of medicine to promote our well-being in a sanitary point of view, a science of law to protect life and property and so on ; why then should there not be also a science of society which shall promote the well-being of communities, or of men in their relation to each other in society? The object here in view is a good and noble one, and must commend itself to every well-wisher of his species. It proposes to remove the evils and sufferings, which grow out of the social state ; to diminish poverty and crime ; to encourage and assist the humblest individual in elevating himself and in improving his condition ; to invest every person alike with the rights and privileges which belong to him as a human being ; and thus to adorn, beautify and elevate society as a whole ; or, in the simple and expressive language of Abraham Lincoln : "to give to every man, however humble, a *fair start in life.*"

It requires only a cursory view to show that the evils of the social state are aggravated and oppressive, and cry out loudly

for intervention and cure. They are the same in our day as they were a thousand years ago. As we have been told, we have the poor with us always, and it would be foolish for us to imagine that any means can ever be devised by which poverty shall be blotted out. Still it has its causes, and many of these may be removed, or the evils and crimes resulting from it diminished. Intemperance, for instance, is one of the most prolific causes of poverty and crime in our own country; but we know that it has been lessened by philanthropic effort. With the adoption of suitable laws and the assistance of a proper police, the sale of intoxicating drinks might to a great extent be prevented. This traffic is a curse to society, and in view of the misery and crime, which it inflicts, ought not to be endured by any community that claims to be respectable, unless it is kept within rigidly legitimate limits. The same is true of other evils that afflict society. Their causes may be removed, or, if not entirely destroyed themselves, they may be greatly mitigated. Wealth, or its unequal distribution, as well as poverty in our day, is the occasion, and often becomes the source of many and aggravated evils. It arms one man with power to oppress and tyrannize over his fellow-man, or combining his means with those of others in like favorable circumstances, he can oppress entire communities, open the avenues to fraud and corruption, set justice and law at defiance, and grind the poor into the dust. Important and necessary as are our great monied corporations, they are not blessings without many admixtures of evil. Capital and labor, it is felt, seldom stand in right relation to each other. Often the maximum of labor is demanded for the minimum of compensation, and on the earnings of the poor laboring man, the rich rolls in luxury, and looks down on him, the creator of his wealth, with scorn and contempt. The evils springing from this source have been lessened, at least to some extent, in the past course of history, as may be seen in the abolition of serfdom in Europe, and slavery in our own country. Why then should we doubt that the remaining evils springing from this source, under the direction of a sound philosophy, may be still further diminished? Closely

connected with the irritating influences of unsanctified wealth are those that have their origin in the spirit of *caste*, which is just as rife here in republican America as in Europe, although it has much less to fall back upon. In enumerating the lists of evils that have fastened themselves upon the social organism, we must not in this place pass over the *wrongs of woman.* It is a long story, and the world by this time ought to know it by heart. But it is certain that it has not, even in Christian countries, been properly laid to heart. The wrongs here spoken of, do not consist in the fact that woman is not allowed to fill the sphere allotted to man, to level the forest, to steer the ship, to stand at the cannon's open mouth on the field of battle, or to rule in the political circles of the country, as is sometimes foolishly imagined; but they consist in another fact, that she is not permitted fully to fill her own sphere, the sphere allotted to her by the Creator. She, in common with man, has a mission to fulfill, which is not confined to earth or earthly things, but extends into eternity. It is, therefore, her right, as well as her duty, to labor with man in promoting all the sacred interests of humanity; to adorn the circle of home and to make it a school of virtue; to be a ministering angel to those in distress; to be a constant follower of Christ in His Church, as she was an attendant on His person whilst He was on earth. She may, as she has often heroically done, labor as a missionary among the heathen on a foreign shore; or at home become the teacher and guide of the young. Nor is she excluded from the sphere of the arts and sciences. Here as well as elsewhere she may be the companion and help-meet to man. She may be an artist, a poet, an author, a philosopher, or a theologian, provided she employs her gifts to beautify, purify and elevate human society. As Dr. Bushnell has well shown in his late work, it is not her province to rule; this as history proves pertains to man with his stronger will; but as the companion, the help, or complement of man, the area of her influence is as broad and wide as his. Here there is room for a true extension of woman's rights, as well as a false and mechanical one. Who does not admire the noble-minded Aspasia, the wife of Pericles, who by her wit

and learning, rivalled her illustrious husband in elevating the tone of society at Athens; or those queens and ladies in the early history of Europe, who first embraced Christianity, then commended it to their heathen husbands, and sought to introduce it among their barbarian subjects? It is a wrong, not only to woman herself, but to society at large, when she is not allowed to discharge the duties and functions of her own peculiar sphere in society. There is room for a reformation here as well as elsewhere, not, of course, in the sense our modern socialists would have it, but in the sense in which a true science of society and of Woman's Rights would dictate.

In all such cases, the reformation aimed at cannot be left to itself without any theory or principle underlying it. Knowledge and science here are as much needed, as in the science of law or medicine. The very fact that socialism hitherto has been based on a falsehood and guided in the interests of infidelity, is the strongest reason, why we should have a social science based on truth and guided by the truth.

A true science of society requires in the first place, a correct knowledge of society itself, or as in the case of all other science, a knowledge of all the facts in the case. The social organization of man is not a mere aggregation of individuals, like so many stones in the walls of a house. If that were so, there would be some ground for that mechanical view of equality, which is so often advocated by the socialistic reformers of the day. Then each individual might, like a stone or brick intended for a wall, be made so many inches long and so many broad, and so be adjusted to his place by an outside builder. But this is not so; society is no such aggregation of parts, but a unity, an organism, pervaded by a common life, and manifesting its vitality by a diversity of organs, each of which has its functions to fulfill. There is an equality here, but not a mechanical one, no more so than there is among the members of the human body. Diversity of sex is the first and most fundamental distinction in society, which cannot be overlooked in any true science of society. This gives rise to the family institution which lies at the foundation of all social well-being and pros

perity. There are also other differences in talent and capacity among the individuals of the community. The diversity here is almost infinite, no two persons having precisely the same talent or tendency. But however diversified the individual endowments may be, they are all adapted in some way or other to promote the general interests. There is a place for each member of the human family, for which he is by nature better qualified than any one else; so that if he be not first at Rome, he may be the first in his country village, or in some still narrower circle of influence and usefulness.

Society regarded as an organism, is something progressive; it must, in order to be in a healthful condition, continually move forward and grow, as in the case of any other living product. Room, therefore, must be made in every theory of society for change, progress and improvement, avoiding on the one hand a dead, petrified conservatism and a violent radicalism, on the other, which strives by violent means to promote growth, irrespective of the true laws of life. As it is one of the chief merits of medical science, to remove obstacles that clog the human system, and so give free play to the living energies of nature, the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, so social science accomplishes much when it points out and insists upon the removal of the evils which press upon the bosom of society, and so prevent it from exercising in an untrammelled way its own living functions. Institutions, which in their day, may have been useful and admirable in their influences upon society, may in the end thus become dead weights upon human progress, and require to be taken out of the way. This is no doubt the state of things at the present time in Europe. Many of its institutions, handed down from the feudal ages, right and proper in their day, are worn out, and ought to be replaced by others. If the voice of a true science is listened to, all will be well; if not, this evil will accumulate, and wars and revolutions will be the consequence. It is not mere fancy to suppose that war with its horrors might, to a great extent, be avoided, if we had correct views of social progress, and statesmen were always able and willing to be guided by correct principles on this vital

subject. English statesmen have been distinguished for their sagacity in this respect for a long time past, and, as a consequence, have frequently repressed civil war among themselves, and immortalized their names by the prosperity which they have inaugurated. Just recently we have had another illustration of their wisdom and foresight in this respect. Their influence and policy, as a consequence, are felt throughout Europe, and no where more so, than in Austria, Italy and Spain, countries which were once the bitterest enemies of heretical Albion.

But whilst society is progressive, and social science must make serious account of this fact, it must also have some fixed principle or law, which shall underlie the movement and control it at every point. Else we should have demoralization, disintegration, and finally, the end or death of Society itself. This can be discovered only by studying the errors and defects of the systems of the past. We have seen that the principle of ancient socialism was *theocentric*, whilst that of modern progress, is *anthropocentric*. They both have truth in them, but as we have seen they are both one-sided. The true principle is the organic union of the two, and is, therefore, not properly speaking either theocentric nor anthropocentric, but *Christocentric*, which includes in one both the divine and human element, just as the divine and human were brought together in organic union in the Incarnation of our divine-human Saviour.

The true principle of social science and social progress is to be found, therefore, in Christianity. It exists there not as an opinion, a speculation, or an abstraction; but as a fact, a power, in the person of Christ, which serves not only as a directory or guide to human progress, but as a new force brought to bear on history, in all respects, comprehensive enough, and sufficient of itself to give society the needed impulse in the right direction.

It is of course not the immediate object of Christianity to promote social reform; it has a higher and holier work to perform in the interests of humanity. Still in its mission of peace on earth and good will towards men, it throws light on the social problem, excites the deepest interest in it and contributes

indirectly to its rational solution. A true Christian Socialism, if such a collocation of terms be allowed in these days, bears in many respects, a resemblance to that which we have been considering; yet, it requires only a cursory examination, to convince us that there is a world-wide difference between the two. By a prejudice and a misinterpretation of Scripture of more than a thousand years' standing, the first Christian congregation at Jerusalem, has been falsely ranked with other communistic organizations, and, it was thus made to give to later monastic orders and a number of mediæval sects their idea of Christian holiness and Apostolic life. The apparent ground on which this mistake rests, is the impression, that the first Christian congregation was communistic in the sense in which that term has been understood in history; but this view has been pretty generally abandoned, since Mosheim, more than a century ago, proved it to be unfounded. In spirit there was at Jerusalem a community of goods, but it was not demanded, neither was it in all cases actualized. Some gave all of their possessions to the Church, and, as in our days, others did not, as appears from the fact, that Ananias was not punished for not having devoted the whole of his property to the Church, but for his duplicity and falsehood.

In like manner it might be shown, that much of the benevolence and many of the reforms of the present day, however much they resemble the fruits of the gospel, are purely natural and human, with nothing spiritual about them. Thus temperance, efforts to benefit the poor, and to diffuse the blessings of education and culture, and other benevolent movements, often move exclusively in the plane of nature. They are good in their place and of much importance to society; but they are only amicable efforts of our poor prostrate humanity, struggling to relieve itself and to hide its own enormities. They stand in no connection with Christ and His Church, and are often advocated most earnestly by those who deny Christ altogether. They flow from the gospel of humanity, as preached by Rosseau, not from the gospel of the kingdom of heaven, as proclaimed by Jesus of Nazareth. Should then all these benevolent move-

ments be condemned as the work of Satan or of one of his apostles? By no means. In their place they are beautiful and desirable, just as civilization and culture are preferable to barbarism. In their proper sphere they are to be praised; but not when they ignore Christianity or attempt to take its place as a new gospel. As Christians, as believers in Christ, it is important that we should understand the signs of the times and not be deceived by appearances. What is born of the flesh is flesh, pure and refined as it may appear, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit. Christ was a reformer as well as a Saviour. He went about doing good to the bodies as well as the souls of men. Who has ever excelled Him in this respect? But He performed all His works of benevolence to make men happier in the world to come, not to create for them a paradise here on earth. He fed the multitude with earthly bread, only in order to have an opportunity to feed them with the bread of eternal life afterwards. Modern reforms do not always do that. In fact, when consistent with their one-sided humanitarian principle, they cannot. This requires that they should adopt the true Christian principle, bring themselves into living union with Christ and His Church, and break with the gay and dissolute apostle of humanity of modern France, whose works and followers are so numerous in our day.

"The appearance of Christ in the world," says Hundeshagen, who has written on this subject, and to whom we are indebted in the preparation of this article, "contains all the elements of a positive renewal of society. The gospel proclaims and confirms the creation of man in the image of God, which is the true nobility of human nature; the essential unity of the entire race, which overthrows all false aristocracy of race and caste, the universal fall and redemption; the establishment of the kingdom of God under Christ the Lord and Head, by which the partition walls of nationality, race, sex, and outward condition are overthrown. Whilst Christianity rises thus above all polytheistic religions and views the human race as a unit, it is equally certain on the other hand, that it never violates the natural basis of human society by overthrowing its necessary outward distinctions, but

aims at an ideal equality, which lies above them in Christ as their common head. The inequalities among men exist by virtue of a divinely established order, and constitute the degrees and members which are necessary for the existence and prosperity of the whole. In their present form, these inequalities are indeed to a great extent the consequence of sin, so that they lead to division, enmity, and rude violence of man against his fellow. But Christianity emancipates the social distinctions from the acute sting of sin and removes those evils, which have their origin in selfishness and pride, covetousness, uncharitableness and idleness, whilst it fills the heart with the spirit of charity and humility, joy and peace, and so sanctifies the different relations and positions of men, that they become so many scales in the service of God, according to the example of Him, who, though He is Lord over all, came to minister and give His life a ransom for many. Thus the Kingdom of God is the Christian reform of society."

ART. III.—RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN THE CHURCH.

IN every religion in the world there is an inner circle, a sort of sanctum sanctorum, composed of persons who, for certain special ends and purposes, separate themselves from the world, and join together in the special cultivation of a religious life. India has her ascetics who abandon everything, bury their existence in deserts, and spend day and night in contemplating the soul of God captive in their bodies, from which it is seeking release. Side by side with these Brahmin anchorites are the cœnobites of Buddhism, for in China, Tartary, and Japan, there are no priests, but only monks, who live under the law of their respective communities. Monasticism appears also amongst the Hebrews in the last days of the old order, for Judaism had its ascetics in the Essenes and Therapeutæ: the first, residing

on the shores of the Dead Sea, were devoted to a life of activity; the second at Alexandria, where they gave themselves to contemplation and prayer, while both classes practiced celibacy and a community of goods, and rejected the use of slaves. "These orders survived the foundation of Christianity, and were known to Pliny the elder, who instanced them as being a people distinguished from all others, 'living without women, abnegating all pleasure, leading an existence of poverty under the palm-tree, ... thus for thousands of centuries, remarkable fact, has this everlasting nation subsisted, and yet no child is born in its bosom, so profound is its hatred to other modes of life.'"

What thus appears (of course in an abnormal and degraded form, according as the religion is abnormal and degraded) in all other religions, began to manifest itself at an early date in the Christian Church. There are those who find the germs of the peculiar form of life contemplated in religious orders already in the infant Church in Jerusalem, where they "*had all things in common.*" The Church here, in form as well as in spirit, renounces the world, in that they sold their possessions and brought the price and laid it at the Apostles' feet; and the Church also instituted a peculiar order or brotherhood, in that distribution was made for the wants of the members out of the common treasury. This order of life, however, in its outward form, we know, was temporary. It was established on account of the peculiar emergency, and when this passed away the Christians, though still the same common brotherhood, still renouncing the world, lived in the usual order of human society, following the various occupations, and filling the various stations in life which are common to men generally. Yet, it may still be held that in this temporary state of society in the infant Church, in the days of its first baptism and early love, there was not only an exhibition of that disregard of the world, and that entire devotion to the brotherhood, which should always characterize the Church, but also a prophecy, we think, of what, from time to time should repeat itself in the same form in the history of the Church, until the *mine* and *thine* entirely disappear in the *our* of the Christian brotherhood. In other

words, there are found here the elements of a sound asceticism, and the spirit of special orders or brotherhoods in the Church, as these may be used for the glory of God in every age.

Nay, may it not be said that in the perfectly beautiful life of our Saviour Himself, we have that after which the Church must constantly strive; and as to its form even, its voluntary poverty, obedience, and full detachment from the world, the model after which those to whom it is given should seek to fashion their lives. We see in the Apostolate also this entire separation from the world, and in the case of Paul a life of celibacy for the glory of God. This feature of the Christian life was especially cultivated in the early Church by the peculiar persecutions the Christians were called to suffer, and the unsettled state of their worldly relations, until they at length, found a local habitation on the earth. "Whilst imperiled society was still capable of regeneration, and martyrdom was the condition of the consolidation of the faith, the saints remained in the world to die in the circus or on the pile at the hour appointed by God. As long as persecution lasted, the men were martyrs who would have been anchorites, and it was not till the moment which saw the dissolution of the Roman society that a new order was organized to replace it, and the bands were disciplined, who when Rome had fallen, were to assume her task and reconquer the universe." (*Ozanam—Civilization of the Fifth Century*).

Asceticism, in its best and purest form thus constituted an element of the Christian life, without as yet seeking for itself a separate organization in the Church. At a later period, however, when the Roman empire fell under the power of the Church, and the worldly element began to make inroads upon the piety and devotion of the Church, this element of the Christian life arrayed itself in separate form against the growing evil, and the threatening danger. Thus *Lingard* explains the rise of Monasticism in the Church. "During the first centuries of the Christian era, the more fervent among the followers of the gospel were distinguished by the name of Ascetics. They renounced all distracting employments; divided their time between the public worship and their private devotions; and endeavored by the as-

siduous practice of every virtue, to attain that sublime perfection, which is delineated in the sacred writings. As long as the imperial throne was occupied by pagan princes, the fear of persecution concurred with the sense of duty to invigorate their efforts; but when the sceptre had been transferred to the hands of Constantine and his successors, the austerity of the Christian character was insensibly relaxed; the influence of prosperity and dissipation prevailed over the severer maxims of the gospel; and many, under the assumed mask of Christianity, continued to cherish the notions and vices of paganism. The alarming change was observed and lamented by the most fervent of the faithful, who determined to retire from a scene so hateful to their zeal, and so dangerous to their virtue; and the vast and barren deserts of Thebais were soon covered with crowds of anchorets, who under the guidance of the Saints Anthony and Pochomius, earned their scanty meals with the sweat of their brows, and by a constant repetition of prayers, and fasts, and vigils, edified and astonished their less fervent brethren. Such was the origin of the Monastic institute." (*Lingard's Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*).

Monasticism, starting in individual anchorites, as St. Paul and St. Anthony, soon became organized into communities of cœnobites, and spread first over the entire East. From thence it extended over the West. "In the recesses of the Appenines; in the secluded islands along the coast of Italy; in Gaul, where it had been disseminated by the zeal of Martin of Louis; in Ireland; in the parts of Britain yet unwasted by the heathen Saxons; in Spain; in Africa, these young republics rose in all quarters, and secluded themselves from the ordinary duties, occupations, pursuits, and as they fondly thought, the passions and the sins of men." (*Milman*).

Thus from the beginning onward we find this feature in the history of the Church. It was in every age an arm of strength to the Church, while at the same time it exhibited the excesses and weaknesses of human nature. At the time of the Reformation we find it in full activity in the dominant orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans. The order of Jesuits, founded by

Don Inigo de Loyola, subsequently became an arm of power to Romanism, as it labored assiduously against Protestantism. Down to the present day the religious orders in the Roman Church constitute one of her chief elements of power. In every great city they entrench themselves, and from thence labor with the greatest self-denial for the advancement of the common interest. Through their zeal, liberality, and self-denial, institutions are founded and endowed, publication houses established, periodicals sustained, missions supported. No one indeed can estimate the advantage which the Roman Church secures through them in her contest with her adversaries.

All this, to the view of some, is enough to condemn all religious orders, viz.: that they have been found in the Church always, down to the present, and in *Romanism* since Romanism has been in the world. But we are disposed to look at the subject differently. To us it seems an evidence that there is something in the principle of religious orders which is right and good, that we thus find them existing in every religion, and in every age of the Christian Church. Instead, therefore, of looking upon the subject itself with suspicion, and shunning and suppressing any tendency to employ the same power which Rome employs, we believe it would be wiser in Protestantism to consider whether she is not thus weakening her own powers and depriving herself of what may be an instrument for great good.

What are called *religious orders* contain within themselves two elements, the one, *asceticism*, the other, what we may designate the idea or spirit of *special brotherhoods*.

It needs not to be said that there are degrees of asceticism, and that there is a true and a false asceticism. Asceticism in its simple idea is moral and spiritual self-discipline, in the way of abstinence from what in itself may be lawful in order to strengthen the moral nature. It grows out of a lively sense of the sinfulness of the flesh, of the necessity of subduing the bodily appetites, and of the antagonism between the world and the Kingdom of Grace. In its true nature, such special self-discipline has been employed in every age. In the case of John the Baptist, for instance, it assumed a form corresponding to the

spirit of the Old Testament dispensation, and his own peculiar work as the forerunner of Christ. He had his home in the wilderness, was clothed in camel's hair garments, and had for his food locusts and wild honey. Our Saviour came eating and drinking, yet, even He, too, the Lord of life and glory, disciplined Himself as the great Athlete, for the great conflict with the devil, by fasting forty days and forty nights, having His abode "with the wild beasts." St. Paul was not ignorant of this sort of discipline, as he describes it to us himself in 1 Cor. ix. 24—27: "Know ye not that they which run in a race, run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain. *And every one that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now, they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible.* I, *therefore, so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air; but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection.*"

No doubt the asceticism of the early centuries of the Christian Church often ran into excess, and also became joined with false views of the Christian life. These excesses may be accounted for in part by the fact that Christianity was confronted with the grovelling worldly tendencies and practices of heathenism. It was, for instance, the degraded condition of marriage among the heathen that led many in the Church to advocate celibacy as a state of superior virtue and holiness. Just as in our own day, the excessive use of intoxicating drink calls forth the counter movement of total abstinence, so these ancient ascetics or abstinents, went often to an extreme; but they must be judged by the circumstances of their times, and the peculiar evils that prevailed around them. No doubt St. Anthony made some mistakes in his application of the words of our Saviour to the rich young man mentioned in the New Testament. He interpreted the words *literally*, "Go and sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, and come follow Me." A wealthy young man himself, when he heard these words, he distributed his goods among the poor and went out to the mountains to wage a conflict with sin and Satan. But if Anthony erred, we would as soon take his chances of salvation as those of many rich young men

in the Church in our day, to whom these words, and those others, "How hardly shall a rich man enter the Kingdom of Heaven," are as an idle tale.

It is not our purpose, however, to consider asceticism as exercised by separate individuals in its bearing on personal piety. We refer to it as an element entering into the life of the religious communities, which multiplied and prevailed so extensively through the past ages of the Church. As entering into the discipline of these communities, it was one of the conditions of their strength and success. As they devoted themselves to a life of special piety and sanctity, they needed a special discipline, especially in view of the peculiar temptations that would meet them. The forming of a system or code for the government of communities that were destined to become so great a power, to exert so great an influence, and to perform so great a work for the Church, required, indeed, great wisdom and even genius. Such wisdom and genius were displayed by a St. Pacomius, a St. Basil, in the East, and by a St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, for the West, and other leaders in the Church. So far as the cultivation of personal sanctity merely was concerned, this discipline was of direct and immediate importance; but in so far as these religious orders in subsequent times laid out for themselves a special work for the Church, their discipline looked indirectly to this end. If, for instance, a special work was to be done among the heathen, such an order would undertake it with the advantages of their strict government and discipline, and with few of the impediments which fell in the way of others undertaking a like work. Surely, in this view, no one can condemn the principle on which sacrifices may be made. If, in order to labor efficiently for the Lord, it is necessary that the brotherhood shall form no family ties, shall espouse a life of poverty and of obedience, who will object to such self-denial, for such an end?

Let us proceed, however, to consider the second element named as entering into religious orders, viz: that of a special brotherhood, *the principle of association for special purposes.*

This is a principle which belongs to man's social nature.

Strength is secured for doing any given work by the sympathy and coöperation of an association. We speak now of associations of a more particular kind than the State or the Church.

The Church is the highest, purest, and best brotherhood for man, in which the social principle of our nature finds its fullest satisfaction. But in the Church, and under the direction and control of the Church, there is still a need for particular organizations, or societies, for specific purposes. This want in the community in general gives rise to societies of an almost endless variety. Even apart from the necessity of associations that are more immediately connected with business, or politics, or literature, we have societies for mutual charity, for cultivating mutual sympathy, &c. Who can name or enumerate them all?

Now what thus expresses itself in the world, seeks for expression also in the Church. A certain work is to be done, and certain persons feel called to do it. Their aims and tastes are similar, they feel moved by the same call, and they join together to work mutually for a common end. Who does not see that there is power here? Isolated and alone each of the members of the association could accomplish little or nothing. He would grow disheartened. But unite the efforts and the sympathies, and you soon find a power which supports each of the members, and strengthens him for the accomplishment of the desired end.

This principle of association, as it inheres in our nature, enters into the religious orders in the Church. But now these orders possess certain features by which, after all, they are distinguished from such societies as we find around us ordinarily in Protestantism, Missionary Societies, Tract Societies, Young Men's Christian Associations, &c. Let us notice and examine this difference, with a view to ascertain whether religious orders can be used by Protestantism.

These Societies in Protestantism, for the most part, are not under the immediate direction and control of the Church, and they do not contemplate nor provide for a "religious life" (using this phrase now in its technical sense) on the part of their

members, nor for the support of those who are leading such a life. Religious orders as they have prevailed in the Church *are* under the control of the Church, and provide, as a rule, for a life of special consecration to a particular work for the Church.

That they should be under the control of the Church we regard as an essential feature in their character. It is not enough that they should be composed of persons who are members of the Church. This alone is not sufficient to keep the organization, especially as it grows numerous and influential, from falling into temptation and error. As such societies profess to be doing a work *for* the Church, they should be guided and directed *by* the Church. At least they should always be so related, that the Church can sit in judgment to approve or condemn.

That they should provide also for a special consecration, in what is called a *religious life*, is also important and necessary.

The great body of the members of the Church cannot make their consecration in just this form, because the Church, while it is not *of* the world is, nevertheless, *in* the world. They must engage in the various avocations of life. Christianity does not call men generally from these, but only sanctifies them for their use. But while this is true of the great body of Christians, it is equally true that there are always those who are called to a life of service directly for the Church, and separate from all the callings of the world. That this principle is conceded, we need only instance the holy ministry. They constitute an *order*, by divine appointment. They are consecrated for life to one work, and that a work which belongs not to this world. They are separated from the world, and set apart for the one great work of the ministry. Their real power depends largely on their realizing this feature of their calling, viz: that they stand forth as separate from the world, while they live and move and labor in it. There is a great mistake prevailing just on this point in the views commonly entertained of the ministry. It is generally held that they have power for their work in proportion as they enter into the world's life, and are carried in its currents. The sociable minister, who joins in feasting and mirth, who demeans himself outwardly as other men, who takes

interest in politics and business, who can therefore talk intelligently with his people on *these* subjects, who can perhaps acquire property, and even wealth, and show his people an example as to what ought to be done with riches,—this is the minister of our day. He is on the streets, often in the shops and stores, attending worldly meetings, and taking part in worldly matters generally. We hold that he is *weak* also in proportion as he gives himself up to a life of this sort.

Our Saviour is sometimes referred to as an example of this kind of religious life. But this is a great mistake. He was of all men most unworldly. He had no property, condescended to live on the charities of His friends, meddled not in affairs of business, of politics, of social economy, nothing of a mere worldly character, except as His holy religion came to baptize it all and consecrate it to the glory of God. No, the minister's true power lies just in his entire separation from the world, while he mingles freely in it.

This element of detachment from the world which enters into the ministerial calling, enters also into societies which are called *religious*. They must also be consecrated to the particular work for the glory of God to which they have devoted themselves, whether in the work of missions, of acts of mercy and charity, of Christian Education, or whatever may be the special calling.

Protestantism has well nigh lost all such organizations. Their schools have been, for the most part handed over to the state, as also their poor, their sick, their orphans. There is hardly any religious work left which calls for a class of persons specially consecrated for it. What does all this argue? Does it not show that the specific work of the Church has, to an alarming extent, been given up to the world? And is not the result of it a growing worldliness on the part of the Church itself?

There can be no question that Protestantism has suffered, and still suffers terribly just from this cause. Only recently is there an awakening to the evil, and now there are indications of a disposition to lay hold of the specific work which is committed to the Church, but which so largely has been given over to the world. An *order of deaconesses* has been established in *some*

Protestant Churches, after the example of the Apostolic Church. This makes room to some extent at least for a special religious work for many women who perhaps have longed for the opportunity to labor in some special way for the Church. The question is agitated in many sections of the Church, in which there is a sense of need in this direction, but in many cases a fear prevails lest to pursue such a course might be a falling into the deadly error of Romanism. The establishment of such an order in the Protestant Church would be a testimony for the high prerogative and calling of woman, worth a thousand-fold more than all the ado made about giving woman the grand prerogative of casting a vote into the ballot box. She is not only an equal of man, but a co-worker in the heavenly work of the holy ministry.

But in order to make this calling effective, it must have a special consecration. The mere appointment of a *Committee* of ladies in a congregation to visit the poor and the sick, is not sufficient. We hear it sometimes said that Protestant congregations develop quite as much special consecration to a life of charity and mercy, on the part of their female members, as Romanism with all its orders of nuns and sisters of charity. We do not question it. We would be badly off if we could not say this much. But does Protestantism recognize and give power, as it might and ought, to this consecration? That is the question. Let such as are called to this work, and are in circumstances to perform it, be organized, appointed, consecrated,—let them in short be recognized and set apart by the Church for this work, and see how greatly their power will be increased. Let them have the benefit of promise and pledge, and the benediction of the Church,—let them have and enjoy a recognition corresponding to that awarded to elders and deacons, and the blessed results will soon appear in the increased efficiency of this kind of work in the Church.

To make this great work of mercy efficient it should be brought under general regulations. Why should the Church not afford the opportunity for a training suited to this work? Must Romanism monopolize the field here, so that sisters of

charity can go out only from her communion, to sit by the bedside of the sick and dying? Let an epidemic prevail, or even an unusual amount of sickness, and see how poorly Protestantism is provided for the work here called for. This fact among others, no doubt, has led the world, with its societies or orders, the Freemasons, Odd Fellows, Red-Men, &c., to under take this work. Members of these orders come and sit up with and nurse the sick of their societies, not because they have more charity, but because they provide for this by their organization.

Sometimes it seems as if there were no demands of this kind as society is now organized, but the need for it can only be developed when the provision is made to meet it. Many a minister, no doubt, who leaves the visiting of the sick to others, finds little call for this kind of work; but let him once enter seriously upon it, and he will soon find that he needs assistance, especially such as woman could render. Until of late the Reformed Church realized no demand or call for providing for orphans. They were provided for in some other way here or there, often in the Poor-house, it is true; but when the Church opened *her* Orphans' Home, it was soon filled with orphans. This work is coming to require the services of those who are willing to devote their lives to this kind of Christian labor. It needs female workers as well as males.

Take again the work of *Missions*. You have here a work which differs from the work of the ordinary pastorate. It requires a special grace, and a special calling, as it brings also special trials and calls for special self-denial. He, who engages in it must be willing to be separated perhaps from a settled life in an old community, and go to the borders, where society is just establishing itself. Or, he may be called to commence work in a crowded city. His work is peculiar in its character. He needs special preparation for it, and a special consecration. But missionaries constitute a *class*. Why should they not have the advantage of an organization, and the encouraging and supporting sympathy of the society? Or if a certain class of young men should desire to consecrate them

selves, under a certain government, to this work, leaving family relationships, and property, for a longer or shorter period, why should they not be encouraged to go out as a brotherhood with the benediction of the Church?

Again, we may specify the work of Christian education, as a work which requires a class of persons specially trained for it. From the Seminary and College down to the common parish schools, the work invites laborers who have a vocation for it. If we are ever to have *Parochial Schools*, their establishment and maintenance will depend just on an order or class of devoted servants of Christ who are willing to work in this peculiar sphere. It must be done as a religious work, not a secular, worldly one. It must be done as the work of the holy ministry is done, not for worldly gain, not as a pursuit or profession, but as a *calling* or *vocation* for the glory of God.

But it is not our purpose to specify the manner and form in which religious orders or societies may be organized in Protestantism. We merely wish to point out some fields which invite self-denying labor, and in which labor may be the more efficient in proportion as the laborers are detached from all worldly callings and associations. These orders would differ from those in the Roman Church, as Protestantism differs from Romanism. They would be divested, of course, of certain elements that have become connected with, if they have not entered into, the religious orders of the Roman Church.

Asceticism in its false character, as it looks upon the bodily appetites as sinful *per se*, as it finds a merit in bodily abstinence without reference to a moral end, as it believes in works of supererogation, as it leads its subjects to the top of a pillar, or into the caves of the mountain,—asceticism in this sense could not enter into Protestant orders. Monasteries, monks and nuns, these are *institutions* of Romanism, and cannot be reproduced by that portion of the Church which has repudiated Romanism. Protestantism cannot produce a Benedict, a Dominic, a St. Francis, or an Ignatius de Loyola. But does it follow that Protestantism dare not trust itself to wield the same powers, consecrated by *her* religion, that these leaders wielded

for *their* Mother Church? We do not believe it. On the other hand we believe that a feature which is found in all religions, and which has formed an element of strength for the Church in every age, may be a feature also of the Protestant Church, without compromising one iota of her principles.

It may, indeed, be asked why, if this be the case, *has* not Protestantism had such orders? Is it not an evidence that religious orders are contrary to the Protestant spirit and principles, that she has not introduced them? To this we may reply, Protestantism has shown her need of them, and has made attempts to institute and use them, though in a modified form. Her numerous societies, to which we have already referred, show this. Missionary Societies, or Boards of Missions, Tract Societies, Bible Societies, Colporteurs, besides the many other societies and agencies of this character, all serve to show the power of the principle here at work. So, too, there have been associations or enterprises which more nearly conform to the spirit of religious orders as they have prevailed for centuries, such as the Religious House for the training of Deaconesses, Mission Houses, Orphan Homes, &c. These often start in the labor and self-denial of one man. Not to speak of the movement in this direction in the Church of England, what is the Mission Institute of the Baptist Spurgeon, in London, but a spontaneous out-cropping of this principle of special work, through a special vocation? He has formed an organization which is accomplishing an immense work of its kind in the city of London. This is not very unlike what Father Hecker, at the head of the *Paulist Fathers*, an *order* in Romanism, is doing in New York, the metropolis of the New World.

But the argument itself is invalid. We cannot conclude that Protestantism ought not to do anything which she has not hitherto done, nor that a kind of work is repugnant to her true spirit because she has not yet fully entered upon it. Protestantism cast aside some things which she found in Romanism, merely because they *were* found there. There are elements of the life of the Church, thus for a time passed by, and even repudiated, it may be, which will yet be reproduced in the free

spirit of Protestantism. This process is going on every day. Things that were once bitterly condemned, are now freely received. We need only instance the style of architecture, which, in denominations farthest removed from Romanism, Methodist, Baptist, &c., so nearly resembles the Gothic churches of the English or Roman Church, that one often mistakes them for the latter. On the spires of these Methodist or Baptist, or even Presbyterian, churches, may be seen, too, that sign, so much feared for a time, *the cross*.

The same thing is true in regard to doctrine and cultus. Protestantism does not surrender any principle, but she feels that she can without danger take to her bosom all that is good and true in Romanism. She could not do this so well at first. Time was needed to confirm and settle her principles. During this period things might be dangerous which are not when once she is grown strong and established. But now, all denominations are turning back to the Reformation, with a view to gather up *all* that legitimately belongs to Protestantism, as a continuation of the one, holy, catholic, Church of Christ.

We believe the same is true in regard to the subject before us. Protestantism has now her societies, which are designed to be as hands for the Church. But these societies lack certain elements, which are needed to render them truly efficient. Or, perhaps we may say, Protestantism needs to take up and incorporate certain elements before she can produce religious orders adapted to her wants, and which will be efficient to do the work she needs to have done. Let us, in conclusion of this article, note what these elements are.

1. We mention, first, a deeper sense of the antagonism or antithesis between the order of this world and the kingdom of grace. The tendency of Romanism is to antagonize these in a wrong sense. Roman asceticism tends to Montanism or Manicheism. Christians are not to look upon the body and its appetites as evil *per se*, nor are they to flee away from the world into the deserts, under the vain imagination that they thus escape the evil. Romanism has looked too much upon the secular as having no affinity for the order of grace. Accord-

ingly its relation to the world comes to be Pharisaic and tyrannical. We see this in her treatment, for instance, of the state, of marriage, &c.

But it must not be forgotten that there is peril in the opposite direction, viz., in making too little account of the antagonism between these two. Christianity is *in* the world, and *for* the world, in that it takes up and saves all who comes to it for salvation. But it saves it really and fully only in *its* order, that is, in the order of Christianity. Beyond the Church, there is, it is true, a conservative power for all the relations of life going out from Christianity; but this amounts to nothing more than a keeping of the world from final doom while the work of grace is going forward. What is beyond this work of grace as it goes forward here, must come in the second advent and the final conflagration, the resurrection and the new heaven and new earth. The early Church had a lively sense of this, as they imbibed the spirit of Christ. He set His people the example, first, of a life of separation from the world. He manifested but little concern for the world in its own sphere, so far as any power to benefit itself was concerned. The state, government, school, science, art, the family, all these to Him were involved in the one helpless misery, and nothing to save could come from them. The one great question which interested Him was that the world should come to believe in Him, and find salvation in Him. The early Church, we say, had a lively sense of this, and it led them to join with all their work for the world, a constant looking for the second Advent. Now, it is easy to see how such a spiritual posture would lead Christians to live as though they expected little from this world, but all from Christ. There is an element in Protestantism which is of a different spirit. The humanitarian tendencies of our age look directly in an opposite direction really for salvation. These tendencies regard the world as capable of salvation in its own sphere, and as needing only certain helps from Christianity to enable it to work out fully its own mission, its own redemption. The family, the school, the state, intelligence, these are the powers that bring salvation is to, and all they need be

strengthened and confirmed by such views and principles of life as Christianity presents for consideration. How far the Protestant Church is drawn into this spirit, we do not pretend to say. But we believe that much of the intermingling of the Church with the world rests, consciously or unconsciously just in this false spirit. Protestantism is becoming secularized to an alarming extent. The ministry, losing faith in the presence and power of the supernatural, reach out after, and cling timidly to, the world. How many allow themselves to engage in worldly enterprises and worldly speculations! In how many ways do they become entwined with the world's associations! And this, too, under the plea that the minister must mingle freely in the world, as Christ did when He ate even with publicans and sinners! The laity, necessarily, drink in the same spirit. The awful rush of business, the maddening whirl of pleasure, the gilded bauble of worldly ambition, these are the powers that come to take away the crown from many a child of grace.

Allow that Protestantism, as a higher, freer stadium of Christianity, is to come nearer to the world, and mingle more freely with it, yet this is to be done only with the greater sense of the antagonism between the two. Now, the societies through which Protestantism performs her work must possess this sense, in order that they may be effective workers. Education Societies, and Boards, and Young Men's Associations, and Bible and Tract Societies, that work as business houses merely, erecting mammoth buildings, dispensing funds,—all this will not do the work, for while all this is going on the Church fails to fill up the ranks of the ministry, she cannot educate her own children, her orphans are under the care of the state, and missionaries cannot be found to labor in the mission fields. What Protestantism needs, is a body of men and women who will consecrate themselves in a special way to self-denying labor, as those who expect no help from the world for its salvation, but who are sent to bring it salvation from a higher world. Such workers are needed to do ministerial work, and also in spheres outside the ministry proper. There are hundreds and thousands of

Protestant Christians, men and women, who cannot enter the ministry, whose hearts yearn to enter the service of the Church in some way, so that they can give all they have and are to the work. These the Church should organize, or open the way to recognize their organization, and thus secure the fruits of their labors.

II. Protestantism in the way indicated, should hold herself ready to encourage and support what we may call special *vocations* in her members. Men have callings in the vineyard of the Lord, and these callings are various according to the various necessities of the times, and the special gifts with which Christians are endowed. Of course the one special *calling* is that to the Holy ministry. But this calling itself has a variety of gifts,—for "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." These gifts point to different kinds of ministerial labor. Among them surely must be included the missionary endowment, the gift of governing and overseeing, &c., and thus we would have men in the ministry who would consecrate themselves to special work. But special gifts are bestowed also on men and women among the laity. Why should not such vocations be turned to account? Some of these have a peculiar calling to labor in a particular direction in a congregation, others in a large field.

There is, indeed, room for the exercise of special gifts as things are in the Church. Much of the work that is done, many of the enterprizes that are started, can be traced to some one individual, but we believe attention is not sufficiently directed to this, nor sufficient provision made to recognize and encourage it. Often the course of such as feel themselves called to a particular work is confused and impeded by the difficulties surrounding our processes of legislation. To take hold of an enterprise by legislative bodies, such as classes or synods, often retards rather than advances it.

But why, it may be asked, cannot the individual, having the vocation go forward and do the work to which he is called as things now are? Simply because the Church is not in proper condition to recognize such vocation, and throw around it her

fostering care and benediction. Hence in Protestantism great and good enterprizes often are started by individuals, and flourish for a time, and then pass out of the possession and control of the Church. From the start it was the work of an individual and not truly and fully of the Church, and it *was* this because the Church did not recognize the work as her own, take it under her care, and thus secure it, and make it permanent. The life and wants of the Church, indeed, come to their expression, not only in synodical acts, but in individual vocations. From these may come Orphan Homes, and Mission Houses, Hospitals, and Schools, or some other interest. How helpless we are, for the most part, especially in the cities, in reference to these interests, and how largely the work of charity and mercy is given over into the hands of the state!

III. Protestantism, or rather Protestant Churches, should recognize, control, and foster *organizations*, having in view special service for the Church. The Church, as such, finds it difficult to carry out her plans by direct agency. Even in congregations, much work could be done that is otherwise left undone, if some proper organization or organizations existed. Many members of the Church spend time and money in societies outside the Church, which could be used to far more advantage in the Church? Even ministers are found in these world-organizations. There is a want to be satisfied; but why could it not be satisfied in the Church. Instead of Free Masons, Odd Fellows, Red Men, &c., let us have Societies, Brotherhoods, &c., *in* the Church. So in the denomination at large. We venture the assertion that more go from members of the Church into such worldly societies than into the Church itself. Surely there is a wrong here. The Societies that exist do not meet the wants of the case, for they are not strictly in and under the Church, and they lack a sufficient bond of union. After a time they run into mere business affairs, managed by a few, while the membership at large cease to feel an interest in the work.

In the course of this article we have roferred to several interests, which, it seemed to us, needed to be carried forward

by the aid of some organizations, which shall devote themselves specially to them. They are of so great importance that we refer to them once more at the close of our article.

First, *The Work of Home Missions.* It has been tried by *Boards;* they are good in their place. Let there be, in addition, a *Religious House*, a special training, and a *Brotherhood.* Many a young man, from the Seminary, would enter such brotherhood, to labor wherever he might be sent, and at any sacrifice; but without it, he looks with dismay to the *far West*, and hesitates, because there is none to *send* him, and to whom he would be joined in a common work.

Second, *Christian Education.* We need a band of workers to consecrate themselves to this work—not as a secular occupation, but as a religious service for the Church. All over the Church they should be at work, organizing and maintaining *Parochial Schools.* Let this interest be taken hold of in this way. Train your men and women for it, and see if it is not practicable to keep up *Church Schools.*

Third, *The Mission of Woman in the Church.* The problem is calling forth the earnest attention of the Church, as well as the community generally. Let our daughters be religiously educated, in Seminaries of the Church, and let the way be opened to train such as may have the vocation to labor entirely for the Church. Call them Deaconesses, Sisters of Mercy, or what you will. Only open the way for woman to do earnest work in all such ways as she is qualified for, and she feels called, and you will give a better solution of the question of Woman's Rights than the world is seeking after.

ART. IV.—THE PERICOPES, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS AND EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

NO. II.

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D.D.

IN our previous article, we maintained that the selection of the pericopes was not arbitrary,—not the work of some gifted individual, following merely his own private impulse and judgment,—but, on the contrary, determined throughout by the habitual practice of Christendom,—an outgrowth of the faith and life of the Church itself. The Creed, the Church Year, with the old selection of pericopes pertaining thereto, and the old liturgies throughout, all, stand in the same atmosphere of faith, and show the presence of the same profound apprehension of the mystery of grace, to which each in its way gives utterance. They follow the same scheme or order: and this order here is in no sense mechanical or outward, but controls with the force of an inward law belonging of necessity to the evolution of the redemptive mystery itself.

We can conceive of a year made up of appointed seasons of thanksgiving and fasting, of varying weeks of prayer and conferences, with skilfully selected portions of Scripture to suit each specific end: but all this, however important it may be felt to be, falls vastly short of the old Church Year and its pericopes. The two differ very much in the same way as a modern programme embracing theological points of agreement, differs from the old "*regula fidei*," the Apostles' Creed. The one centres throughout upon the objective mysteries of grace, and follows of necessity the order of the Creed: the other follows subjective, religious impulse, and centres upon some specific, accidental interest. It is not difficult for any one to feel

this difference, especially when the two systems come into antagonism. They cannot be made for any length of time to play into each other. They are found, in fact, to be irreconcilable, because they are not of the same spirit, have not the same principle, and belong not to the same order of Christian thought.

It is in this view that an examination of the old pericopes, as related to the Church Year and to the liturgical services of the early Church, has been regarded by us as of great practical account. To study their inward relations, to mark their general organization, and to apprehend their theological significance in this form, are well worth the time which may be devoted thereto. Hence we hesitate not to continue our previous article, giving first a brief summary of what has gone before.

In the Creed, immediately following the conception and birth, we have the suffering, crucifixion, death, and burial of Christ, not as so many historical incidents merely in the life of Christ, but as mysteries for faith, belonging necessarily to the unfolding of the great central, redemptive mystery of the Incarnation itself. Just as the conception by the Holy Ghost moves forward into a real human birth, linking thus the supernatural to the very constitution of the world's life; just so, also, from this, does the same mystery move forward in the way of a real human existence into the bosom of our fallen history, to wrestle with its awful curse through death and hades, not of course to a termination of itself in death, but to a full assertion, in the midst of this, of its redemptive power and glory, as revealed at last in the triumphant issue of the resurrection from the dead and the ascension to the right hand of the Father.

Now, as we have maintained, this necessary and sublime order of the Creed is that which governs the Church Year from the very beginning; and the selection of the accompanying pericopes is controlled throughout by the same. The Creed commences, it is true, with "*God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth;*" and by some this may be regarded as in-

consistent with the structure of the Church Year, demanding for this latter, at the outset, a *Theological* rather than a *Christological* beginning. The Church, however, never regarded this first article of the Creed as implying that God through the creation reaches a full revelation of Himself as challenging faith. On the contrary, the Church saw the full revelation of God as Creator, only in the mystery of His only-begotten and incarnate Son, in Him "who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, * * * * * *; all things were created by Him and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." The Creed refers us to no vision of God through nature, in the interest of natural deism; but to the vision of God in Him towards whom the whole creation looks, and in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in whom also the sense of the whole creation, physical, rational, and spiritual, is brought to a proper revelation.

In full harmony, therefore, with the Creed do the pericopes begin the sacred year with the *Advent* series, in which the whole economy of nature and revelation is viewed as looking towards the mystery of Christ's coming, as towards the centre of its whole process,—the full, heavenly, response to all its wants and aspirations, its types and prophecies, its whole moral and religious development,—the new creation, in which the old is comprehended and carried onward to its consummation in such form that God, the Creator, is declared and seen as never before. So also in the same series, all present history is made to look to His second coming as the full, heavenly answer to its whole movement, because thereby is completed in time that great mystery of redemption which, in the first coming, apprehended the world, and is now carrying it onward to such issue of judgment and glory. This is the meaning of the Advent series, joining the beginning and end of the whole creation in sublime synthesis in Christ, the Alpha and Omega of the universe.

In the Nativity series, in immediate relation to this, we have

this coming itself. The Word,—the source and substance of the whole finite order from the beginning, as well as the full articulate utterance of God,—the light and life, making a pathway through the world's suppressing darkness,—at last becomes flesh, by a real human birth links Himself organically with the constitution of the world, and dwells among men, revealing in Himself the Father, being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person. In the octave of the Nativity—the circumcision—as the child of Mary, He passes sacramentally into a birth-inheritance of the Old Testament supernatural economy, which contained for Him, and for the world, the whole reality of all antecedent divine revelation among men.

In the Epiphany series, the same hallowed mystery moves forward, authenticating and manifesting itself among men by attestations from on high,—the Star, and the opened heavens at His baptism,—and by attestations from within, as the theanthropic consciousness of Christ begins to assert itself at the Temple, and as afterwards He manifests forth His glory in works and words. This manifestation, however, is in the bosom of our fallen humanity. It could in no sense actualize itself here without first breaking through the barriers of the world's false life, overthrowing the empire of Satan, and gaining for itself, through victory, dominion and glory. The Epiphany of Christ, therefore, of necessity arrayed against Him the whole empire of darkness. He challenged by His very presence the terrible conflict. Claiming for Himself, against the tempting and usurping adversary, the headship of all principality and power, He wrests from his hands the keys of death and hades. Bearing in our humanity the curse, He exhausts it. Dying, He transcends the whole law of death; and Himself the high priest, offers up His body on the altar of the Cross, making through the power of His endless life both the priesthood and the sacrifice, and all the attending facts, of perennial virtue and efficacy for the world.

This mystery of conflict, this solemn labor and warfare of the Captain of our Salvation, reaching out into death and hades, fixes for the Church Year the season of the Quadragesimal fast.

And what is this whole movement but the order of the Creed, authenticating itself in all the services of the Church, and finding a practical utterance and embodiment for itself among God's people? What else does it indicate other than the blessed repose of faith in the perennial power and significance of these Creed-mysteries throughout all ages in the Church?

But, to resume. The pericopes, looking towards this Quadragesimal season in way of preparation, close, as we have said, with the Sunday in Quinquagesima. They are especially adapted to deepen in the mind of the Church a sense of that necessary conflict between the life of the world and that of grace, and a sense of the consequent danger also in which every Christian, while surrounded with temptations and with the powers of evil, is involved, whenever striving to manifest the reality of his heavenly birth in grace. The selection is of such a character throughout as to open the way for the Ash-Wednesday proclamation of the fast, by steadily enforcing the solemn import of a full detachment from the whole order of the world's life, so that in temptations and trials, in labors and warfare, the child of God may have power to turn from the vain pomp and pleasures and remedies of this present world, and find his rest and support and delivering strength in the powers of the world to come,—powers which are made to confront him in the continuing efficacy of just those mysteries which the pericopes in harmony with the Creed bring to the vision of his faith. No language can better express the purpose here, or more beautifully bring before us the whole order through which the pericopes move, than that of the old Litany. "*By the mystery of Thy holy incarnation; by Thy holy nativity and circumcision; by Thy baptism, fasting and temptation; by Thine agony and bloody sweat; by Thy precious death and burial: Good Lord, deliver us!*"

Ash-Wednesday is the proper proclamation of the Quadragesimal fast, called therefore in the Liber Comitis "*caput jejunii*," and by the Greeks, "εισβασις των αγιων νηστειων."*

* The designation Ash-Wednesday no doubt arose from the custom of sprinkling ashes upon the head of those entering upon a course of penance. As this day opened

The lessons for this day are selected, therefore, with direct reference to the idea of fasting, unfolding what may be regarded the proper attitude of spirit for such an act of penitent self-humiliation, and the reasons and aim of its institution upon the part of the Church. The fast is not to be viewed as an arbitrary imposition from without,—a new patch upon an old garment,—but as that which finds itself answering an inward disposition of self-abnegation and detachment from the world, and in full harmony with that Christian spirit which sighs in secret for heavenly and imperishable treasures, over against the moth and rust-corrupted, and thief-invaded wealth of the world. But the fast rests not in that which is negative merely,—in simply weakening and breaking the fetters which bind to earth,—but in something positive as well,—in strengthening and cementing the ties which bind to Heaven,—in turning with the earth-freed and undivided heart to God, the only tower of defence against the hosts that assault the heritage of the Lord.

Following this solemn proclamation, comes the Lent series of pericopes, taking up, in harmony with the Creed, the suffering, crucifixion, death, and burial of Christ, and what these mysteries involve for faith. The first Sunday in Lent, *invocavit*,* has for its gospel lesson, selected with peculiar appropriateness, the fasting and temptation of Christ (Matth. iv. 1–11) immediately following His sacramental inauguration into His public ministry by His baptism in Jordan, which was attested by the voice of the Father, and sealed with the investiture of the Holy Ghost. In this selection, the Church designedly brings before us the primal, base fact of the whole conflict reaching out to death and hades, and the incipient victory also, which shadows forth the glorious consummation, when the whole kingdom of Satan is

---

the specific penitential season of the year, it gathered to itself in a particular way this general custom, pursued in reference to penitents at all seasons; and thus drew to itself naturally such title.

* The first word of the Introit, taken from the close of the 91st Psalm [*clamabit* in the Gallicanum Psalterium: invocabit (MS. invocavit), in the Romanum Psalt.]—a Psalm which beautifully harmonizes with the whole scene of the Temptation, where, in the obedient trust and calm triumph of Jesus, the wondrous ideal of the inspired poet finds its only and perfect actuality.

overthrown, when the whole law of death is transcended, and Christ asserts His triumphal glory by entering the opened Heavens, leading captivity captive, and dispensing, through the eternal Spirit, gifts to men;—an omen thus of the coming woe, and a prelude of the certain victory.

It falls not within our purpose to attempt any detailed exegesis of the Gospel lesson. It is enough, in this connection, to remark that Christ's being led into the desert wilderness, and His long fasting and prayer there, were in no sense a shrinking from His mission among men, but an inward consecration thereto, corresponding to the mysterious reality of His sacramental inauguration in the preceding baptism. He could not forsake the world which on every hand demanded Him; nor could He realize His mission of redemption therein, except in full renunciation of the false attitude of its whole life. Called to the world by His whole mission, called to it by its own deepest wants, He was at the same time repelled from it by its own opposition, and by that of the prince who ruled in and over it. Such inward consecration to His calling, therefore, brought into clear survey the whole necessary pathway of conflict, the whole terrible wrestling with a false world-life. Indeed, the more complete the consecration to the Divine will (here perfect), the more undivided the dependence upon the supernatural, and the more entire the independence as regards the perverted world-order, the more direct and concentrated and powerful, on this account, the antagonism of the whole kingdom of evil. On the one side, the Heavens open, in glorious assignation of His Messianic office; but, on the other, the deep abyss of Hell is uncovered,—all the forces of evil feel the challenge, and unmasked, rapidly combine in opposing array, training their devilish enginery, so that the whole ministry of Christ must find itself a warfare from the very start, moving in the midst of this antagonism of forces, this conflict of light and darkness. The "glorious Eremite," standing by His consecration in the bosom of light, Himself light of light, and always poising Himself upon God, and confronted by Satan and his whole 'gloomy consistory,' begins a ministry involving all possible ethical antipathies and sympa-

thies, and whose issue must be final, and forever decisive. The crisis here is not only solemn, but absolute for the whole world.

In this view (although of course entirely inadequate), it is not difficult to see the profoundly significant relation here between the Gospel and Epistle selection. In the latter (2 Cor. vi. 1–10) we pass from the ministry of Christ in the flesh to the ministry of Christ in the Church. These two ministries are indissolubly joined together by the Spirit. "As the Father hath sent Me into the world, even so send I you." We, says the Apostle, work together with Him. The ministry in the Church perpetuates in the Spirit the ministry of Christ, and moves into the bosom of the same opposing forces,—the same world-wide antagonism, and is to assort and approve itself in the midst of antipathies and sympathies, by honor and dishonor, by good report and evil report, by death and life, by sadness and rejoicing, by poverty, yet making many rich, by having nothing, and yet possessing all things,—thus making real all the while the gospel mystery in which we see an "*Eden* raised in the *waste wilderness.*" It is this also which clothes the whole ministry of grace with such solemnity as to force home upon the Christian consciousness of all the need of that inward consecration, as well as that outward divine guardianship, which the Collect so earnestly prays for,—that self-fortification in the Lord to wrestle with principalities and powers as co-workers with Him, who, in the fasting and temptation in the wilderness, opened before Himself the obstructed pathway of redeeming love, and now calls us, especially in this appointed season of the Church, to take His Cross and follow.

The second and third Sundays in Lent, in the Gospel lessons, (Matth. xv. 21–28; Luke xi. 14–28), form a direct continuation of the first. Christ, on the threshold of His ministry, having met the Tempter, assaulting Himself, conquered Him. Now, in the prosecution of His redeeming mission, He carries the reality of this victory into the whole kingdom of Satan's disorganizing power among men. This disorganization shows itself in the physical as well as moral; and both serve to render more in-

tense the feeling of man's helpless misery. The reality of victory shows itself in both also, now in the awakened faith of those struggling with their misery, as they turn to the delivering grace, and now in Christ's exercise towards such of a cleansing power, dispossessing the devil of his lodgment within their life. Before the hallowing presence of Christ in His Messianic mission had entered the world, the devil, strongly armed, kept his palace and his goods securely; but the conquest in the wilderness revealed one still stronger, who, having overcome, now taketh from the devil all his armor wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. The prosecution of this mission, however, concentrated on Christ the false judgment and malicious retort of the deceitful and now exasperated enemy. He casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils,—the precursor of that infatuated cry, "*Crucify Him! crucify Him!*"

Now in perfect harmony with this objective work of Christ in the flesh, cleansing those in whom the devil had taken his residence, the Epistle lessons (1 Thess. iv. 1-8; Ephes. v. 1-9) take up that inward cleansing which the mystery of Christ, now present in the Spirit, must accomplish in every child of grace; the sanctification of the body as the temple of the Holy Ghost, the full cleansing of it in our vocation wherein we are called unto holiness and not unto uncleanness. All lusts of the flesh and all lusts of the mind show the presence of the vexing devil, making his return to the house whence he came out; but the children of the light, following Christ in the strength of His continuous victory, must manifest the reality of their birth in grace by their persevering victory over every such possible inward lodgment of the evil one. Here, as before, each lesson serves to deepen the sense of the solemn mission of self-consecration, of full detachment from the world of flesh, and full reliance on the powers of the world to come, which constitute the practical aim of this whole Quadragesimal season.

It is not out of place to remark here how very frequently this significant relation of Epistle to Gospel occurs throughout the pericopes of the Church Year, as though the Church were determined at all times to place the mission of Christ in the

flesh and His mission in the Spirit in mysterious synthesis before our faith. For example: The circumcision of Christ, which marks His sacramental birth-inheritance into the old theocratic economy as the child of Mary, has for its corresponding Epistle lesson the birth-inheritance in the new economy of grace by baptism,—a circumcision not made with hands. The consecration at the Temple, when the developing consciousness of His divine paternity leads Christ to pass quite beyond all the earthly associations of Nazareth, and turn to His inquiring Mother with such a penetrating question, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" has for its corresponding lesson again, the Christian's self-assertion of his position in grace by offering his body *a willing sacrifice*, and by conforming not to this world, but by being transformed by the renewing of his mind. This peculiar connection of lessons, which might be illustrated by any number of examples, is not fanciful and arbitrary. It rests upon the logic of Christianity itself, which regards the mysterious facts of the Saviour's life in the flesh, as perpetuated and made efficacious through the Church, age after age, among men. They are synthetized, of necessity,—as in the Creed,—by the power of the Holy Ghost.

We come now to the fourth Sunday in Lent, the lessons for which it is more difficult to understand in their relation to what goes before and to what follows after. This difficulty, however, is greatly obviated by bearing in mind that this Sunday marks the transition in which the work of Christ is coming to be viewed more in its positive character as making the humiliation through which He passes the base of a glorious exaltation. The sufferings of Christ are not to be viewed solely as so many painful experiences forced upon Him from without, awakening our deepest sympathies, but as so many positive redemptive acts, so many high-priestly offerings, in the consciousness of which our sympathetic self-abasement may be interfused with rejoicing, hope and love, as brightening from its shadowy twilight towards an Easter dawn. Christ not only suffers and dies as beleaguered by persecuting Jews, and Romans, and

principalities of evil; but, in the midst of all this, He offers Himself through the eternal Spirit, entering by His own blood into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. His broken body is to become the bread of eternal life; His poured out blood, the cup of immortality.

This Sunday, as marking such transition, has been very appropriately called mid-lent Sunday, looking back to the conflict in the wilderness and forward to the atoning sacrifice, and intermingling thus the lent, penitential sorrow with an incipient paschal rejoicing. The services of the Ancient Church made this Sunday, as it were, a table land in the valley of humiliation, from which might be descried, although from afar, the Cross glittering with light, which must turn the dark wilderness into an illumined paradise, and soon restore to the worship of the sanctuary the sounding Alleluias intermitted since Septuagesima. The Introit at once strikes the key-note—"Lætare Jerusalem et conventum facite omnes qui diligitis eam: *gaudete cum lætitia qui in tristitia fuistis;* ut exultetis et satiemini ab uberibus consolationis vestræ."* The prayer (oratio) continues the same: "Concede, quæsumus, omnipotens Deus; ut *qui ex merito nostræ actionis affligimur, tuæ gratiæ consolatione respiremus;*" after the pattern of which the Collect in our 'Order of Worship' was formed. It must be evident from this that the Gospel and Epistle will be selected as moving in the same atmosphere of thought, the same tone of feeling. It is just this, as we have remarked, which renders it less difficult for us to catch the idea of the lessons selected for this Sunday.

The Gospel (St. John vi. 1–14) shows us Christ revealing this contrast, that, although He would not make bread out of stones at the call of the Tempter to appease His own hunger, He will yet marvellously multiply the loaves and fishes for those who, in following Him, have come to want;—that out of His fulness their necessities shall be met. At the same time, this was to be a trial of the faith of His disciples, turning them from their niggard earthly supply to Himself, whence cometh the mul-

* Arranged from Isaiah, 66th chapter.

tiplied loaves; yea, whence cometh the bread of life. The lesson still further includes, both from its connection with the season and with the context of the gospel itself, the precious symbol that His body broken shall mysteriously multiply itself into a world-embracing Eucharistic feast. Lange has well expressed this symbolic element, when saying that, "in this miraculous feeding of the multitude, Christ announces Himself as one who, with His own being and life, satisfies the hunger of the world—who, by the sacrifice of His life, prepares for the world an eternal Eucharist, and feast of highest, truest, nourishment." Thus, as remarked just above, Christ does not pass through the conflict of suffering and death simply as a passive recipient of the persecuting malice of the world and the devil,—a martyr only by steadfast, heroic resolution in the path of virtue, so that the whole process terminates at the Cross, save in so far as it may stand out an imperishable example for subsequent ages, engaging our sympathies and stimulating our endeavors. Rather Christ turns the whole humiliation and suffering and death, although to the earthly sense quite opposite, into the glorious mystery of a high-priestly offering—the absolute sacrifice, in the perennial presence and power of which alone can we ever receive life everlasting. The Gospel lesson looks toward this. The large and hungered crowd, the want of money to purchase bread, and the small, inadequate supply, stand in marked contrast with, and to the eye of flesh indeed in direct opposition to, the festal satiety which followed. Neither Philip nor Andrew can find any answer to the Saviour's testing question, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat," other than the two-hundred pence and the lad with five barley loaves and two small fishes. So in the case of the hungering, famishing world-crowd of ages, physically and spiritually helpless, what answer can be given to its yearning cry, Whence can we buy bread, that we may eat and not die? It is vain to look to the poor array of worldly resources here, or yet to the manna even which the Fathers ate. But *lætare*, there is a response in the mystery that Christ giveth His flesh for the life of the world. That which the world might regard, and did regard, the very

evidence of weakness and failure, becomes to faith the very source and substance of a festal, all-nourishing Eucharist for the Church.

> "Crux fidelis! inter omnes
> Arbor una nobilis!
> Nulla talem silva profert
> Fronde, flore, germine:
> Dulce lignum, dulce ferrum,
> Dulce pondus sustinens."

In full harmony with this general contrast, where two orders stand over against each other in such form that what is regarded weakness in the one becomes a condition and often a measure of strength in the other,—where the limitation and emptiness of flesh in the one are met by the freedom and fulness of spirit in the other,—a contrast reaching its full, paradoxal height in Christ, through whom an ignominious crucifixion becomes a glorious paschal reality of delivering and nourishing life,—in full harmony with this, we repeat, is the Epistle lesson (Gal. iv. 21–31), which joins its peculiar "*rejoice thou barren that bearest not*" with the "*lætare*" of the Introit. In this lesson we have brought to view the sharp contrast between that which is according to the flesh (*κατα σαρκα*: within the resources of the natural world, justifying and authenticating itself to the apprehension of sense and natural judgment), and that which is through the promise (*δια της επαγγελιας*: in the bosom of the supernatural,—the revelation of God manward, justifying and authenticating itself to the apprehension of faith). Ishmael is begotten fully in the order of nature, and according to human policy; and to those walking in the flesh he must have been regarded as the only possible inheritor of the promise. Even Abraham, in the perplexity which besets him, can see no other *whence* he can be a father of nations, than through Ishmael; and therefore he says unto God, "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" Isaac is begotten through the promise, directly in the face of impossibilities, when earthly relations only are brought into view. Abraham "said in his heart, shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah that is ninety years old

bear?" Subsequently, also, Isaac is received as one from the dead. The Apostle sees the deep, symbolic import of this, in making it an allegory through which the Messianic kingdom of grace is contrasted with the covenant of law, and with the whole order κατα σαρκα. The former gendereth children after the Spirit, in the bosom of supernatural realities; while the latter gendereth children in bondage under the elements of the world. Moreover these two elements are in hostile attitude. That born after the flesh persecutes that after the Spirit, and must be cast out as having no part in the glorious inheritance. The process in the Church, therefore, is a continuous crucifixion of the flesh, with the affections and lusts, only to give proper room, however, for the fruit of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith.

Dr. Fr. Strauss sees very clearly, in relation to this Sunday, the transition and contrast to which we have called attention, although he seems to ground it upon the natural year-season, with which beyond doubt it does, when occurring at its normal period, most beautifully harmonize.*

From Mid-Lent Sunday onward to Good Friday, the Gospel selections bring out the conflict of light and darkness as now rapidly converging from lesson to lesson, towards the certain issue of the cross. As the powers of evil from every side draw nearer the Holy One in their exasperated endeavor to overwhelm Him, so He at the same time draws nearer to the bosom of His Father, confidently and entirely reposing upon His decisive judgment as both honoring Him and visiting condemnation upon His enemies (the *judica* of the fifth Sunday's Introit); and draws nearer, also, in the fervor of His redemptive love, to that small circle of susceptible souls in whose immediate presence He unfolds the hallowed mysteries of all this, as related to His high-priestly sacrifice and intercession. Anon,

---

* . . . das (licht) in ganzen Yahre nicht wieder so viel Blendendes hat als in dieser Zeit, die, wenn sie auch bis zum Eintritt der Sonne in den Widder allen Völkern eine Zeit der Trauer und der Klage blieb, doch, mitten in Klage und Trauer zu Jubel un Hoffnung aufwacht. Also Licht! Und auf dieser Grundlage die Freude der Hoffnung in der Trauer!" (Evangelische Kirchenjahr, s. 196.)

also, does He send lightning glances of glory from His person athwart the surrounding darkness, confounding while they exasperate the enemy; and then by His humble yet majestic repose amidst accumulating trials, transcending thus the whole pomp of His adversaries, He thrills with new ardor the hearts of those who love Him. There is, indeed, in the progress of these Gospel selections, a sublime climacteric grandeur, such as should characterize the closing scenes of the world's most profound tragedy.

In the gospel selection for the fifth Sunday (St. John viii. 46–59), Christ throws a bold challenge into the face of His conspiring foes, bringing them at once to the bar of judgment; confronts them with the untroubled calmness of His innocence saying, "I honor My Father and seek not Mine own glory"; startles them with the mysterious utterance, "If a man keep My saying he shall never see death"; confounds them by arraying the testimony of Abraham against their unholy use of His name, affirming, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it, and was glad"; and brings them at last to the exasperated silence of casting stones at Him, by the calm assertion of His eternal pre-existence, in those profound words, "Before Abraham was, I am";—each and all mysteries far more precious to us than blasphemous to them, because so many manifestations of His glory.

The selection for the next Sunday's Gospel (St. John xii. 1–16),* transfers us from the throng of fierce persecutors to

---

* In the Liber Comitis, the Gospel selection for this Sunday, "*Dominica in palmas,*" commences with Matth. xxvi. 2. But for the following day, "*feria secunda,*" the Gospel selection is the same as in our "Order of Worship." I will append here the schedule for this day as given in the "Conspectus Pericoparum" of Daniel. (Codex Lit. Tom. 2).

Liber Comitis	Marc. xi. 1 sq. (not given in Migne's edition nor in the synopsis by Augusti.) Matth. xxvi. 1 sq. Phil. ii. 5 sq.		
Ecclesia Romana	Matth. xxvi. 1 sq. Phil. ii. 5 sq.	Ecclesia Angl.	Matth. xxvii. 1–54. Phil. ii. 5 sq.
Ecclesia Evangel.	Matth. xxi. 1 sq. sive. Matth. xxvi. 17–29. Phil. ii. 5 sq.	Inasmuch as the week beginning with this Sunday took up the entire Gospel history of Christ's Passion, very easily a difference of lessons, for a given day, might occur by a difference in harmonizing the several accounts.	

the sweet retirement of Bethany, into the bosom of that beloved family, which now prepares for Him a supper, where Martha serves, and Lazarus, recovered from the corruption of the grave, sits in silent, holy awe, and Mary breaks the long-treasured, costly spikenard, and pours it on His feet, and wipes them with her hair. It seems as though we might now lose sight of the opposing darkness. But no! It has advanced only in depth and power. It has entered the select band of Apostles, and now casts over this hallowed scene of refreshment an appalling gloom; for Judas, who will betray Him, is there, reproving Mary's precious act of devotion, to which the Saviour gives such fulness of meaning, when saying, "Against the day of My burying hath she kept this." The rebuked Judas is silent. But there can be no repose when so near the awful crisis. The depths of hell are too violently disturbed; and now, almost as issuing therefrom, we hear the muttering conclave of chief priests consulting to put both Jesus and Lazarus to death.

The selection, however, does not close here. Christ enters Jerusalem to complete the mysterious sacrifice,—Himself the victim to be offered, now hastening to the altar which He will sprinkle with His all-atoning blood, and by one offering perfect forever them that are sanctified,—and Himself the King, whom the Prophets foretold, and whose prophecies the disciples unconsciously fulfilled in shouting their "Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord,"—the very anthem with which so uniformly the old liturgies (and our order of worship, also), rapturously welcome the mystery of His coming to the Eucharistic altar, Himself the sacrifice and the royal dispenser of the heavenly feast.

The Gospel lesson for Good Friday is the *Crucifixion*. According to the flesh, this would be viewed as the last and closing scene, leaving no room for Easter vigils. Indeed, because nature cannot transcend its fall, all tragedies, creations of the inspiration of genius only, close with death. But this, the work of the Eternal Spirit,—the inspiration of the imperishable life of Christ's person, transcending the whole law of

death, cannot close thus. It must of necessity sweep onward into the sphere of resurgent glory. "*Thou wilt not leave His soul in hades, neither wilt thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption.*" Therefore Good Friday is followed by the paschal vigils, including Easter Eve, or the *Sabbatus sanctus*, opening the way for the Dominica Sancta, or Easter. The Gospel lesson for this holy Saturday, in the Liber Comitis, is selected from Matth. xxviii. 1–8, linking the end of the Sabbath with the dawn of the first day of the week. Here, from the angel who sits upon the stone which he has rolled back from the door of the grave, the women receive the announcement of the resurrection, and hasten to bring the disciples the joyful word, not as yet, however, *having seen the Risen One.* In the "Order of Worship," the Gospel selection (Matth. xxvii. 57–66), does not so immediately connect itself with the Easter dawn, but takes up the burial, and marks the wondrous attraction of the holy sepulchre, over against which, after Joseph of Arimathea has departed, the loving Magdalene and the other Mary sit lingering and hoping and watching, not able to fathom the strange, prophetic emotions which are stirring within the deeps of their souls. In examining the Epistle series we shall see the same difference between the Liber Comitis and our Order of Worship in regard of this Easter Eve,—not a difference of faith at all, but a difference in the degree of nearness which is assumed in relation to the Easter dawn.

Let us now take up the Epistle series accompanying the Gospel selections which we have just now been discussing. Here we turn from the conflict as historically unfolded in the life of Christ in the flesh, to the inward mystery involved in the same as perpetuated by the mystical presence of Christ in the Church through the Holy Ghost,—the same synthetizing process to which we have had occasion already to refer, and which shows itself, as we shall subsequently see, in its full significance in the relation of the two great divisions of the Church Year, the one moving up to Pentecost, the focal point of transition, whence the series is then evolved onward to the

second Advent, in full harmony throughout with the Apostles' Creed. Indeed, just as the general law of the genus in the vegetable world, for example, finds utterance for itself throughout the whole structure of the individual plants in bud and leaf and blossom and fruit, just so does the general, plastic law of the Creed bourgeon, leaf, blossom, and fructify throughout the service of the Church Year. But of this hereafter.

In the Epistle selection for the fifth Sunday (Heb. ix. 11–15), we have a lesson designedly chosen to bring into clear view, not the outward facts of Christ's sufferings and death, but the inward mystery of the same as having for mankind a perennial redemptive force. They are high-priestly offerings in the tabernacle not made with hands, clothed with imperishable reality because offered through the eternal Spirit,—the absolute life-power resident in the person of Christ, the very mystery which we see affirmed in the corresponding Gospel in the words, "If a man keep My sayings, he shall never taste of death," and still more emphatically in the statement, "Before Abraham was, *I am*."

So in the next Epistle selection (Phil. ii. 5–10 :—it should include the 11th verse, as in the Liber Comitis), the whole course of Christ's humiliation is made to be the base of that wondrous exaltation in which God gives Him a name above every name, challenging the adoration of all things in heaven, and in earth, and under the earth, and forcing from every tongue the confession that He is Lord to the glory of God the Father. The scattered palm branches, the sounding hosannas, which, if not from human tongues, must rise from the very walls and stones, the costly spikenard enfolding with fragrant odor the sweet entertainment of love, *all* given in the Gospel are indeed but the faint, earthly presension of the exaltation of the Epistle, where all things above, around, and beneath bend their knee at His name, where the everlasting doors of the New Jerusalem are lifted up that the King of Glory may come in, and where the quiet supper at Bethany is transfigured into the marriage supper of the Lamb, fragrant with the breath of eternal love. But the Epistle here, as elsewhere and almost

universally, must view the objective mystery as realizing itself subjectively in us through the Spirit. The exaltation, following the humiliation, and so organically linked therewith, is to repeat itself in the Church and in us. Our mind of self-abnegation and humiliation is made so to find its source and substance in that of Christ (εν δμιν ὃ και εν χριστῳ) as to give all the while the warrant of our having fellowship in the glorious power of His resurrection.

In the next Epistle lesson, selected for Good Friday (Hebrews x. 1–25),* we have the mystery of Christ's death in its most profound significance unfolded, and as nowhere else so sublimely. All the shadowy sacrifices of the Old Testament economy are made to find in Christ's sacrifice their fulfilment, and to pass away, giving place to *it*, as absolute and of ever enduring efficacy for the world, as consecrating a new and living way for us into the holiest, and as being an offering which perfects forever them that are sanctified. Here, as so often before, we recognize again how the two,—the objective historical reality, and the perennial efficacy thereof through the Spirit in the Church, are designedly synthetized in the lessons selected by the Church. Our whole process of sanctification is but the authentication within us of that objective self-sacrifice of Christ,—of that one offering by which He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Delitzsch, in his comment upon these words, wherein the full emphasis of the Epistle selection rests, says with great force, "Sanctification, involving here both imputed and implanted purification from sin, is the way whereby the objective perfection already provided in the self-sacrifice of Christ gradually renders itself subjective in men." The Church cannot on Good Friday celebrate the death of Christ as a past historical event simply, but adds to the Gospel narrative such an Epistle selection as may emphasize the truth that the offering made upon the cross is an ever abiding reality, by the presence of

* There is no regular Epistle lesson in the Liber Comitis. Our "Order of Worship" has here followed the Anglican Church; and very properly, for the selection is in full harmony with the general law regulating the pericopes, and not one of mere private caprice. On this ground it is that we treat it as genuine and in place.

Christ within the Holy of Holies, and by His presence through the Spirit in the Church. We cannot forbear quoting Delitzsch again, who has so finely grasped the meaning of the Epistle in this regard. "Christ brings before the face of God no offering which has exhausted itself, and, as only sufficing for a time, needs renewal; but He Himself is in person our offering, and by virtue of the eternal Spirit, *i. e.* of the imperishable life of His person, now forever freed from death, our eternally present offering before God." Dr. Nevin, in a recent article of this Review, has seized with even greater clearness and breadth of apprehension the deep truth which this Epistle selection unfolds; and no doubt it was under the impulse of just this method of Christian thought that the selection was originally made, and it is on this account that we find it so fully in harmony with the order of selections more ancient and more universally recognized.

The Epistle selection for Easter Eve in the Liber Comitis, (Coloss. iii. 1–4), is in unison with its corresponding Gospel, which conducts the vigil, as we have said, to the annunciation of the resurrection, although not to the vision of the Risen One, which belongs properly to Easter. Just as the women hurrying to the grave, which, although naturally the residence of the dead, has yet for them some mysterious attraction, as holding all they hold dear, which draws them they hardly know why, before the dawn breaks, to its very door, when the Angel calms them startled either by the earthquake, or by His own lightning countenance and glittering raiment, and says, "He is not here, for He is risen;" just so the vigils of the saints hurrying out from the pilgrimage of lent, looking and hastening unto the vision of the resurgent One, and feeling that all Christian life is mysteriously hidden with Him, awaits a kindred conclusion in which when Christ shall appear they also shall appear with Him in glory.

The Epistle selection in our "Order of Worship," (1 Peter iii. 17–22, originated we presume by the Committee), is also in full unison with its corresponding Gospel. The Gospel refers us to the burial—the rest with the dead, the vigil not con-

ducting us as yet to the Easter dawn. The Epistle, therefore, is selected as taking up the hidden, redemptive, significance of this as related to the intermediate state, to the Spirits in Hades.

Thus through the whole lent series of pericopes up to Easter, the selections are uniformly symmetrical, and designed throughout to emphasize the profound theological truth, that the objective facts or realities, as in the Creed, have a perennial redemptive power, surrounding now and interfusing the whole life of faith, because in the presence of Christ by the Spirit, in the Church they are continuously operative, apprehending and being apprehended in our whole process of sanctification. In other words, the Church in the organization of lessons so designedly related to each other, and so controlled by the order of the Creed, throughout her services gives utterance to what may be regarded the very substance of her constitution—the fulness of Him now filling all in all—or in the eloquent words of another, "the perennial, undying objectivity of the Christian salvation as holding from first to last, with the force of an endless now, in the Mediatorial Life of the Incarnate Word."

The fast period is now closed, and we reach the Pascha *αναστασιμον*, or Easter, the great paschal season, which, as a festival period, clusters around itself a series of pericopes gradually moving forward, after the order of the Creed, from the Resurrection to the Ascension and to Pentecost. The selections are controlled at first by the Easter mystery; but gradually in their transition they mark the coming ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, towards which mysteries they steadily direct the attention. It is more correct, however, to say that the selections are designed by their very order and contents to bind the meditation and thought of the Church to the Resurrection, not as a doctrine, or a finished past fact, but as the mystery of that life now victorious over death and hell, and unfolding its inexhaustible fulness by moving forward into the Ascension and outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The transition to which we have referred begins properly at the third Sunday after Easter—*jubilate*. The selections which

precede are more immediately conditioned by Easter, while those which follow refer with increasing directness to Pentecost.

The Gospel selection for Easter Sunday in the Lect. Gall. is Luke xxiv. 1 sq.; in the Lib. Com., Mark xvi. 1–7; the same in the Calendar Rom.; in the Anglican Church, John xx. 1–10, which our 'Order of Worship' has followed, and which does not substantially differ from the more uniform selection from Mark, neither from the selection in the Lect. Gall. The selection from St. Mark takes up the earliest Easter dawning, in the Angelic annunciation to the women who came with sweet spices to anoint Christ's body—the first breaking light of the glorious mystery.

"Gaude, plaude, Magdalena
Tumba Christus exiit,
Tristis est peracta scena,
Victor mortis rediit."

The selection from St. John adds to this the further progress of Easter when the mystery begins to be authenticated to the Apostles John and Peter. As yet in both cases it is the empty grave and the Angelic announcement only which recall to the disciples the promises which had been given, and which now enter as so many momenta in the awakening susceptibility which shall at last rapturously receive the Risen One. In the case of St. John, however, whose love was so deep, and whose eagle glance reached out so far, these outward circumstances alone are enough to bring quickly home to his heart the reality for which he had sighed since the hour in which he had stood overwhelmed with strange loneliness at the cross. He believed. The mystery of the resurrection found lodgment in the depth of his spirit never to depart therefrom.

Of course these gospel selections, by themselves alone, would be quite insufficient to unfold the outward, historical elements of the resurrection. But in the services of the Church they were supplemented by the lessons immediately following for Easter Monday and Tuesday, as well as by the lessons for the

Octave of Easter, and in such form also that we may see the mystery rising before the disciples from its reddening dawn to its effulgent noontide.

The Gospel selection for Easter Monday in the Lect. Gall. is Mark xv. 47—c. xvi. 1–11; in the Lib. Com., and Calen. Rom. Luke xxiv. 13–35, the same as in our "Order of Worship." In the lesson from St. Luke we have the revelation of the Risen Christ to the two disciples at Emmaus, for which He had prepared them on the way by unfolding the Old Testament references to Himself, and by showing how these clearly pointed out the pathway of suffering and death, through which He was to enter into His glory. This was added to the preceding circumstances, the empty grave, the vision of angels and their announcement, and the visit of John and Peter to the sepulchre. The Easter light is searching after and penetrating every susceptible heart, whatever darkness may stand in the way; intercepting here the departing two, who still keep in mind that it is the *third day*, and inwardly contend against their despondency; sending its piercing ray into the deeps of their troubled spirits till their hearts burn within them; and at last hurrying them back to Jerusalem overflowing with joy, to spread the glad tidings which they had not strength before to believe.

The selection for Easter Tuesday in the Lect. Gall. is Mark xvi. 12 to the end; in the Lib. Com., and Calen. Rom. Luke xxiv. 36–47. In this lesson, for the two are in reality one, the Easter light reaches its first height of effulgence, when Christ stands among the gathered disciples and says, "Peace be unto you," and confirms the mystery within them by all the possible evidences which either faith, or reason, or sense even, can demand or desire.

A series more beautifully connected, or more grandly progressive and instructive, from the angel seated on the stone rolled back from the grave to the Risen One, standing among His own and breathing upon them peace, cannot possibly be conceived. The more inward movement also, of struggling hopes and longings, sweet memories of promises still cherished,

clearer intuitions of prophecies, and at last joy overwhelming both fear and belief—the resurrection of Jesus within the spirit of the disciples—what celestial charm, what lyric pathos it has!

We turn now to the corresponding Epistle lessons. Here as before we pass from the outward, historical fact to the inward, spiritual mystery involved therein, which is made to be continuously effective by the presence of Christ through the Spirit in the Church. This in truth is just what the order and relation of the Canon of the New Testament, as organized by the Church, brings to our view. The Epistles are but the inspired utterance in the bosom of the Church, and in the process of its developing life, of Christ's presence in the Spirit, making real all the while the mystery of His presence in the flesh. The Epistles are bound back to the Gospels by the intermediate outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and the planting of the Church —the canon in its *order* follows the Creed, and in both the Pentecost mystery binds what goes before, and what follows after in organic unity. This general and profound synthesis, perpetuates itself so to speak throughout the pericopes in the relation of the Epistles to the Gospels, and designedly as is abundantly shown by the peculiarity of selection. When such relation is violated by the selection we shall invariably find some powerfully disturbing cause growing out of the immediate circumstances of the age, which for the time was felt to demand especial regard. We have already had occasion to remark this in reference to the singular Epistle selection for Circumcision in the Lectionarium Gall. It now meets us again in the singular Epistle selection for Easter Sunday in the Liber Comitis, viz: 1 Cor. v. 6–8. No doubt Augusti is correct in assigning the cause which he does for this selection, and in using it also as an argument in favor of the great antiquity of this collection of pericopes. Before the settlement of the Quartodeciman or paschal controversy by the Council at Nicæa, a custom prevailed quite extensively in the East of joining Easter immediately with the Old Testament pasch, and of observing it as a fast. The decree of the Nicene Council sought to do away with this, and

occasioned of course great excitement for the time, and demanded upon the part of the Bishops special attention and care. Hence they sought, where the old custom still prevailed to impress upon the people the great and necessary distinction between the Church pasch and that of the Jews. This gave currency to this selection from the Epistle to the Corinthians; and in confirmation of this, we find Chrysostom, in his Easter sermon at Antioch, employing the selection for just such purpose. Its subsequent retention in the collection rests upon the well-known aversion of the early Church, to change any custom having the Orthodox sanction of age. (See *Augusti*, Vol. VI. page 204).

The Easter Epistle in the Lect. Gall. is 1 Cor. xv. 1–19, —a normal selection, showing no such disturbing force as seen in the Lib. Com. In this lesson, the Resurrection comes to view, not in its outward, historical character, as an event in time, neither as a mere doctrine of the speculative reason, based upon a past fact, but as a mystery carrying with it the force of an ever present, death-conquering life, now, and at all times, the source and substance of our resurrection in such sense as that without it all that are asleep are perished. The Epistle in our "Order of Worship," Coloss. iii. 1–11, following here the Anglican Church, shows the same purpose of selection, taking up the fact that our mystical union with Christ is such as to bring us at once into full fellowship with the glorious power of His resurrection. "If ye were raised together with Christ, (*συνηγερθητε*)," referring back to the conditional statement of their being dead with Him, (Chap. ii. 20), and through this back to the unconditional statement of the fact of their having been buried together with Him in baptism, (verse 12)—*then*, the reality of this fellowship should show itself, on the one hand, in our death, so far as the order of the flesh,—the old man, is concerned, and on the other, in the continnous quickening of the new man, renewed after the image of Him that created him. The resurrection here, as in the other selection, is viewed as the source and substance, from beginning to end, of that life which is hid with Christ in God, that life which is in harmony with its

original divine idea, and which is so bound to the presence of Christ in the Spirit as to reach its consummation only when Christ's presence shall come to its full revelation of glory at the last day. This profound truth of revelation is beautifully expressed in one of the old Easter hymns:

> "Resurrexit, et revexit
> Secum Deus hominem,
> Reparando quam creando
> Dederat originem."

The Epistle for Easter Monday in the Lect. Gall. is Rev. i.–ii. 7, and Acts ii. 14–39; in the Lib. Com. Acts x. 34 sq., the same as in our "Order of Worship." Both lessons from the Acts, alike bring into view the mystery of the Resurrection as fundamental to the very constitution of the whole ministry of the Church, as the central Gospel-fact, in the witnessing of which the whole Apostolate properly begins, and in the power of which it ever proceeds. The selection from the Apocalypse is to show that the resurrection is such a manifestation of the life of Christ's person as forever to seal the fact that He, now walking in the midst of the golden candlesticks, is the One who liveth, and was dead, and behold is alive forevermore, and hath the keys of Hades and of death,—the first begotten from the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth. The Epistle for Easter Tuesday in the Lib. Com. is Acts xiii. 16–33,—the magnificent appeal of Paul to the Jews,—"and we declare unto you glad tidings," (the very core of the whole Gospel), "how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled unto us their children," (the absolute response of Heaven to the whole scope of the old economy), "in that he hath raised up Jesus again, * * * now no more to return to corruption." Such selections as these in the old Lectionaria, penetrating at once to the very heart of the mystery which constitutes the festival, show the broad, comprehensive grasp of the faith of the early Church. Other selections of course might have been made, but none so thoroughly in harmony with the grand sweep of the old Creed, and none in the way of progres-

sive inter-relations manifesting such a wondrous architectonic genius.

The Sunday after Easter,—octabas Paschæ, called in the Lect. Gall. the close of the pasch (clausum paschæ), and by the Greeks, *Κυριακη του Θωμα,* completes in its Gospel lesson, (John xx. 24–31), what was left incomplete in the manifestation of the Risen One on Easter Sunday. The Easter light, emerging from the darkness of the grave and hades, searched after and penetrated every susceptible soul, as we remarked. But one of the eleven, not present at any of the appearances of Christ on the day of His rising, seems to have been so wedded to what may be called external evidence—the order of the world, and so unable to conceive the possibility of such a mystery as that of one coming from the grave in glorified life after crucifixion and burial, as to wave aside the whole statement of Peter and the others, determined not to believe unless he should see in His hands the print of the nails, and put his finger into the print of the nails, and thrust his hand into His side. How vividly do the outward, phenomenal elements of the Saviour's death still impress this disciple, who seems inclined to rest his faith thereon, as though faith here must of necessity be the result of external evidence, resting not in a supernaturally wrought intuition of the mystery of Christ's person unfolding the reality of such glorification from within, but upon a mere corporeal identity reaching at most no farther than flesh and sight, a revelation after all of flesh and blood only. The Easter light, before there can be any proper *clausum paschæ*, must show itself able to penetrate through this dark barrier of earnest, it may be, yet misguided skepticism, and give to faith its proper victory through a vision of the Risen One far transcending the mere measurement by sight of identity in the flesh. The presence of Jesus, directly challenging Thomas in his own guarded skepticism, brings at once from the inner spiritual susceptibility, still existing and now aroused, the unequivocal, unconditional response, "My Lord and my God," in the reality of which as truly of the Spirit no other witnessing from abroad can be longer required or indeed thought of.

In most beautiful and significant correlation with this is the Epistle selection, 1 John v. 4–10. In the Gospel lesson the world was near gaining the victory. Thomas, perplexed by what he must have felt to have been the fatal issue of the cross, depressed, and melancholy, separated himself from the other disciples, no doubt, however, seeking to convince his own mind in some way that the issue must be otherwise. The announcement to him that Christ had been seen by the disciples, although he could not conceive it to be possible, aroused in him his almost surrendered trust and hope. His susceptibility for the supernatural, not yet sufficiently purified and elevated to grasp the mystery of Christ's person, is, however, still active, and brings him back to the disciples, although demanding the clearest, outward evidence of sense before he will come to believe. It was, however, the tremendous power of just this outward evidence of sense, as in the crucifixion, which had so disturbed his trust and troubled his spirit, and which had to be overcome, and as he thought, by outward evidences of like character, although in opposite direction. Christ was dead, a certainty for sense and worldly judgment. The nails went through His hands, and the spear-thrust opened wide His side. These must be seen in His body now as alive again. But the mere vision of flesh could give nothing beyond the fact of being alive again as before, a fact far short of the mystery of the resurrection as a full transcendence of the whole sphere of mere natural life in the flesh. The spiritual body cannot be determined by carnal measurement, any more than the mystery of the Incarnation can be determined by anything in the sphere of flesh and blood. Now the Epistle is selected to show that faith can ground itself in no sense upon the worldly. The whole order of nature, with all its various powers and resources, science, art, government and whatever else may be added thereto in the same sphere, is entirely inadequate to satisfy the demands of religious life. It cannot by any of its processes, however far these may be carried, pass out of death into the victory of imperishable life. Indeed, as fallen, it stands in necessary antagonism to any such mystery. But this imperishable life, not a doctrine of immor-

tality, but the reality itself, covering body, soul, and spirit, entering the world in the Incarnation, and revealing its full victory, by the Resurrection, over the whole law of sin and death, reigning therein, and continuing an ever present, quickening energy through the Spirit in the Church,—this mysterious reality, we repeat, not as referring itself to judgment based upon proof beyond itself, but as apprehended by faith brought into exercise in its own immediate presence, gives to faith a power transcending all worldly forces, whatever may be their form or character,—a power never resting back upon the world for support, but on the contrary ever bringing this latter into its own sphere as its only home of deliverance and life. Thomas, standing in the holy presence of the risen Redeemer, no longer asks to put his fingers in the nail prints, no longer tries in vain to prop himself upon any extraneous evidence of such character, but exclaims, as the glorious intuition thrills his spirit, "*My Lord and my God.*" So must the world pass out of itself into the obedience of faith confronted by the powers of the world to come.

The Gospel selection for the second Sunday after Easter, (John x. 11–16), is substantially a continuation of what precedes. The disciples, by the awful tragedy of the Cross, scattered as sheep when the wolf enters the fold, have been seen in the preceding lessons running here and there, fearing the world, perplexed, disheartened and without any proper home, but at last *enfolded* by the shepherding presence of the Risen One, who quiets their consternation, and breathes upon them His own calm and triumphant peace. Thus Christ, while lodging within their spirits the image of Himself as risen and revealing to them that He leaveth not His sheep, but layeth down His life for them, and the disciples in turn joyfully recognizing and receiving Him as coming from the dead, both alike verify the precious statement of the lesson: "*I am the Good Shepherd, and know My sheep, and am known of Mine.*" An old Easter hymn has finely seized upon this meaning of the lesson. * * "triumphali morte resurgens. Ducens secum primitiva ad cœlos membra et nuper dispersa revocans ovitia." The lesson,

however, carries us onward prophetically to the completed fold of the Church; for the Resurrection must move forward into the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and the establishment of the Church. The connection of the corresponding Epistle-selection (1 Peter ii. 20–25), is too apparent to need any remark.

The series of Gospel-lessons now, commencing with the third Sunday after Easter (jubilate), and continuing to Pentecost, connects itself immediately with this prophetic intimation of a fold ingathering both Jew and Gentile under the one Great Shepherd. The lessons, as before remarked, look forward to, and prepare the way for, the Ascension and outpouring of the Holy Ghost. The Easter Mystery must be viewed as widening into the glorification at the right hand of the Father, and into the coming of the Spirit to seal and make effective forever the presence of Christ in the Church. To mark just this, and to impress it upon the mind in the services of the Church, what more suitable selection could possibly be made than the Gospel-lessons, taken from the sixteenth chapter of John, where, as no where else, this profound subject is discussed and unfolded by the Saviour Himself!

We need not take up the lessons in way of separate exegesis. They are so bound together as a whole, that it will be sufficient to indicate here the great truths with which the Church, by their selection, designed to challenge the attention. First, it is quite evident from these lessons, that the glorification of Jesus, as returning unto the Father, is made the source and substance through the Spirit of the glorification of His people, and that this reality shows itself in the fact that the victory of Christ over the world is through the Spirit the very substance of such victory among His people, as they are brought within the sphere of a supernatural kingdom, in which are resident the powers of the glorified One, the powers of that æon into which He has ascended now made effective for the world through the Spirit—powers, which not only transcend the world, but which continually pass judgment upon it, and unmasking its evil bring it under condemnation. A little while, and the disciples shall not see Him, *κατα σαρκα;* but the dispensation in the flesh shall

be transcended, and again the disciples shall behold Him in the glorification of the Spirit. They shall have sorrow at first, as having no proper intuition of the mystery of this transition, and still too much wedded to the preceding stadium of His revelation. But their sorrow shall be turned into joy. Indeed their transient season of lamentation shall be but a birth-travail from the sphere of worldly vision into the glory of a new spiritual intuition and power, a joy which no world buffeting can dislodge from their faith. (*jubilate*). I go to the Father, but I return in the presence and power of the Comforter, bringing back to you the reality of full victory over the world in the fulness of the Spirit; who shall overcome the world either by convincing on the one hand or by convicting on the other, (ελεγχειν), bringing it to that most fundamental consciousness of sin, as not believing in Christ; bringing it to that most fundamental consciousness of righteousness manifested in the glorification of Jesus; and bringing it also to the most fundamental consciousness of judgment in that despoiling of principalities and powers, that condemnation of the prince of the world, openly declared through the Cross and openly attested by the consequent resurrection and glorification, a crisis indeed in which the disciples, however, pass out of condemnation into life. (*cantate*). The whole work of the Spirit is thus a glorification of the revelation in Christ Jesus as this is made to glorify the world. Now in the bosom of this mystery of mediation linking through the Spirit the earth beneath to the Holy of Holies above,—the throne of intercession, all prayer and petitioning must be made in the Name of Jesus. In the bosom of His mediation in the Spirit, in the presence of that one offering not exhausted, but perpetuated forever because offered by that eternal Spirit through which by the Cross the way was opened for the full assertion of victory in the resurrection and ascension and outflow of the Holy Ghost, all rogations, all litanies, all askings are to be made (*rogate, Dominica ante Litanias*). Indeed the intercession of Christ is but a mysterious manifestation in itself of the Father's love. Binding our petitions to itself, it is the continuous activity in which the High Priest

bears us, in whom He is Himself glorified, upon His heart into the immediate presence of the Father, who hath given us to Him, His Son.

The connection of the corresponding Epistle-series with the Gospel-lessons it is somewhat difficult to determine. There may have been some disturbing cause at work conditioning the selection here, as we have seen to be the case elsewhere. The joy, of which the Gospel for Jubilate-Sunday speaks, springs from a spiritual communion with Christ, in which the soul is lifted above its worldly surroundings. And this joy is placed in broad contrast with that which has its source and end in the flesh. In fact we find that the rejoicing of the world is placed directly over against the sorrow and lamentation of the disciples, "*Ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice.*" Just this contrast was made of special emphasis in the old service, as is evident from the fact that it constitutes the *verse* and *response* for the third nocturn, and is introduced in the *Antiphon* for Vesper. The Epistle may have been selected with direct reference to this, because therein Christians are guarded against all fleshly lusts which war against the soul, guarded against all joy whose source is in the order of this world, in reference to which, they, as risen with Christ and to ascend with Him, are to be as strangers and pilgrims. Whatever persecutions may be brought upon them on account of their seeming want of sympathy with worldly interests, must be met by no opposition in the same sphere, but on the contrary by that calm, spiritual composure and peace which reigns in the soul in communion with God, and which will ever place them in right attitude to the whole order of the world's life, although they may wrongfully endure sufferings for conscience toward God. This places the lesson in close connection with the preceding Epistle, serving as a continuation thereof.

The next Epistle-lesson may have been selected, because the gift of the Spirit, as sent from the Father, is to be viewed as the source of all good and perfect gifts coming down from the Father; so that Christians at all times, from their regeneration by the Spirit to their glorification in the same, may so feel their

entire dependence upon the supernatural, as to have their patience and meekness confirmed, by fixing their hearts, amidst the world's opposing vanity, there where alone are to be found true joys and everlasting peace. The Spirit is to guide into all truth, speaking whatsoever He heareth, and this mystery demands that the order of the world's life be surrendered in full obedience to His engrafted word which is able to save the soul. The next Epistle-lesson connects itself immediately with this, and gives practical expansion to its truth. The humble reception of the Spirit-engrafted word (ἔμφυτον implanted with germinal life-power), now manifests itself in inwardly energizing and characterizing the whole activity of life.

There is evidently a penitential undertone in this series of Epistle selections, such as comes from a sense of the broad distinction between what the fleshly mind and what the spiritual mind regard as the proper elements of joy. The difference, here, is so great (especially emphasized both in the Gospel and Epistle lessons), as to constitute the Christian a pilgrim and stranger in the world, seeking his joy and his citizenship in the heavenly. This brings upon him of necessity the world's opprobrium, which, while it may disturb, must not cloud the vision of his faith, and which, while it may harass, must not tinge his intercourse in the world with gloomy impatience or angry rebuke. This penitential feeling, so natural when the spirit is turned towards the heavenly, and severed from the earthly, standing as it were upon the summit of Olivet, and gazing into the heavens, into which the source and centre of all its love has ascended, to come again at the last day in glory ineffable,—this penitential feeling, now awakening the prayer, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus," or now the kindred exclamation, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ," has found full expression for itself, in connection with this season, in the old, special three days' service following this rogate Sunday; and, perhaps, as moving toward this, the selection of the Epistle lessons was to some extent controlled.*

---

* This three days' service (*tres dies rogationum*), may have originated, it is true,

Space does not allow us, in this present article, to examine the pericopes beyond Ascension. We will conclude, therefore, with some general reflections upon the relation holding between the Church year and the natural year,—a relation which comes most prominently into view in just this cycle which we have been traversing. The relation of man to the lower, material order of nature, is at once obvious. In his own constitution the spiritual and material are seen to interpenetrate each other. These two worlds are mysteriously wedded together in the unity of his life. Man, therefore, not only finds within himself capacities opening toward the spiritual, and never satisfied until there is a real apocalypse of the heavenly; but he finds himself also interlinked, in all the ethical as well as physical elements of his being, with the whole order of nature existent in space and time. The world surrounding him, with all its various space-forms even, enters into the mould of his being. Though we are high-priests of nature, seeing quite beyond it the "vision splendid" of "that imperial palace whence we came," yet in an important sense

> "We are what suns, and winds, and water make us;
> The mountains are our sponsors, and the rills
> Fashion and win their nursling with their smiles."

But in a more profound sense still, as more cognate to our soul-life, does the world, surrounding us in its ceaseless change and flow in time, involve us in its own periodic movement, and bring us into a sort of rhythmical harmony with itself. The completing cycles of the year have not only an outward movement beyond us, but are transfigured, so to speak, into our own physical and spiritual being, in such sort that we move onward with them and they with us, with a mysterious inward correlation

---

from some special circumstance,—perhaps may have been instituted by Mamertus (480), Bishop of Vienna, on the occasion of a dangerous invasion of wild beasts, (Vid. *Du Cange sub voce rogationes*). Still the continuance and extent of the custom may find its ground in the felt congruity of such a service with this particular season of the Church year. What *originates* a custom may be far different from that which *extends* it, and *continues* it for ages.

throughout. The year-cycle is not a mere arbitrary chart, mapped off into nearly equal divisions, to suit some mechanical ends—an almanac simply. It is a grand completed movement of the whole system of nature in which we stand, and with which we are in sympathy, not merely by a determination of will, but by the very constitution of our life. Man cannot, except by a harsh, unnatural stoicism, fail to articulate this sympathy, or fail to give expression to his sense of the deep, inward analogy holding here between his life and that of nature, by making the periodical time movement of the latter instinct with the spiritual contents of the former, by insphering it indeed with the ethical movement of his own life.

Hence, not arbitrarily and in the interest of mere fancy, but rather by the force of a real inward correspondence, has the religious life of humanity always linked itself with the order of nature, so as to make this in its recurring time-revolutions, the bearer of its own experiences, so as to transfigure it into its own image and likeness. The correspondence here, although it may be so deep and hidden as to escape our analysis, and incomplete because of the disorganization of sin, has yet been universally recognized, and we have reason to believe will find its full completion when the spiritual body and the new heavens and the new earth shall coexist in the glory of the resurrection. As might be expected, in heathenism the religious year is largely submerged in the natural. This is the case to such an extent indeed, as to lead many to refer the whole mythology, and all the pagan religious ceremonies, to a physical back-ground exclusively. In Judaism, where a direct divine revelation lodges itself in time, and develops its contents through history, the mysteries of the supernatural will control the formation of the sacred year, not shutting out the natural, but really apprehending this, and carrying it up, in proper accord with the intimate correspondence referred to, into its own higher movement and meaning.

The week-cycle here, reflecting the divine creative mystery, holds within itself for us a precious symbolism, in which the completed earth-activities come to blossom into a hallowed

sabbatic rest—ever recurring from year to year, because that rest yet *remaineth;* but sealed to us by the unfailing warrant of Christ's resurrection, (the completed recreation) which makes the Sabbath now the Lord's day of the Church,—dominica dies, just as each year has become an annus Domini. Yet more significant, for the purpose we have in hand, is the sacred Jewish year, made up of these recurring week-cycles, but beginning by divine ordinance with the paschal festival, which is linked by Jehovah Himself with that period or epoch in the natural year which most intimately and impressively adumbrates its spiritual import. "And the Lord spake, saying, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months. It shall be the first month of the year to you." The reason of this is quite evident from the context. It was to be the time which marked the deliverance from Egypt and the destroying Angel,—the beginning of a new and brightening period reaching out to their entrance into the Holy Land,—the renewal of the promise which had slumbered so long beneath the chilling frost of Egyptian servitude,—the significant turning-point of the whole national theocratic life,—the profound symbol too of that mystery of mysteries through which, in the pasch of grace, humanity shall be delivered from sin's bondage and renewed, and the long slumbering promise shall awake into glorious, eternal fulfillment. Who can fail to perceive here the significant correspondence between the natural season, (the vernal equinox), and the festival itself, neither fanciful nor arbitrary, but by the very ordinance of God Himself? Hence our faith has full right to bring into clear vision all the analogies, all the hidden inward coincidences which may serve to transfigure for us the whole natural into the supernatural.

We cannot in this article speak of the subsequent Pentecost, although here again we are met by the same profound correspondence. We hasten to remark that the Jewish sacred year is brought to its proper fulfillment in the Church Year. The New Testament pasch or Easter is the hinge of the whole Church Year, just as the Resurrection has come to mark off the recurring week-cycles. It is the focus from which the whole antecedent

movement is illumined, and the whole subsequent development irradiated. As a movable feast it is *Anni parens*, and as immovable (March 25), it is *Radix temporis* (*See F. Strauss, p.* 221). Here as of right the correspondence between the life of nature, and the revelation of the supernatural, comes to its fullest significance, far transcending what meets us either in Judaism or Heathenism. Spring resurgent from the grave of winter, breaking through the rock-closed sepulchre, rousing from slumber the myriad hidden germs of earth, and bearing upward into the genial air the whole awakening vegetable world, glorifying the crude material in forms of grace and beauty which hasten to send their blossoming fragrance towards the uplifted gates of light, renewing the whole face of nature,

"*Aëriamque novo faciem splendore serenans*," (as Arnulf so beautifully sang),—making the whole earth jubilant, and the whole air resonant, with the universal joy of such renewal,—what is all this, but a magnificent parable, read and understood as never before, when Easter has removed the veil and shown us its own hallowed spiritual counterpart, transfiguring it in our faith, preparatory to its transfiguration in glory? What Heathenism and Judaism aspired to in this regard, Christianity has accomplished, fulfilling thus their whole prophecy, and that of nature also. The old Easter hymns could not well fail to seize upon this truth. It meets us indeed everywhere as the spontaneous utterance of faith.

["Eia harmoniis, socii, laudum resonis
Hujus splendide vernantis celebremus gaudia simul temporis."]

And again:

["Ecce renascentis testatur gratia mundi
Omnia cum Domino dona redisse suo.
Tempora florigero rutilant distincta sereno,
Et majore poli lumine porta patet,
Jamque triumphanti post tristia tartara Christo
Undique fronde nemus, gramina flore favent.
Legibus inferni oppressis super astra meantem
Laudant rite Deum lux, polus, arva, fretum."]

To regard this a weakness of Christianity, and an evidence against the Church Year, because manifesting a false accom-

modation to pagan naturalism or a shrewd calculating, compromise with the world's credulous superstition, is in the end but a denial of all relation between nature and grace, a veritable losing sight of the grand truth that the Incarnation is the mystery which interprets, and gives meaning to the whole symbolization of nature. As well might the fundamental fact of Christianity, the Word made flesh, be regarded as an accommodation to the oriental incarnation process, or the occidental apotheosis, because fulfilling the prophetical element underlying each.

Easter, as we have said, is the hinge of the whole Church Year—the centre of the whole antecedent and subsequent movement. Hence it does not commence the sacred Year as did the passover in the Old Testament. The advent of Christ in servant form, who revealed not the glory lodged in His person, except through the struggle and victory of the Cross, but ever moved towards this, just as the germs of nature through winter lie hidden to come in the end, however, to a real epiphany of all the possibilities lodged within them,—the advent properly begins the Church Year. Yet only in the light of Easter does this throwing back of the beginning of the sacred Year to that of the natural year become significant; for it alone gives to that natural winter-beginning its proper spiritual transfiguration in such form as Judaism could not and did not.

We cannot follow this subject further at this time, and attempt to trace out in detail this beautiful, far-reaching and profoundly significant correspondence. Strauss in his valuable work on the Church Year has, with great research and with a peculiarly fine æsthetic insight, brought this element into prominence; and no one, who will make it a subject of earnest study, can fail to be more thoroughly struck with the truly wonderful architectonic genius displayed in the structure of the Church Year, embracing in its comprehensive compass and reorganizing under the power of its higher principle all that has gone before in the efforts of religion to construct a sacred Year.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The Proverbs of Solomon; Ecclesiastes or Koheleth; The Song of Solomon. *New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway,* 1870.

These books of the Bible are published in one volume, in the series of Lange's Commentary, edited by Dr. P. Schaff. The commentary is by Dr. Otto Zöckler, Professor of Theology at Griefswald, and the translations are, the first by Rev. Charles A. Aiken, Ph. D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; the second edited by Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL.D., and translated by William Wells, A.M.; the third by W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, N. J. Dr. Zöckler belongs to the younger generation of German divines. He is but *thirty-seven* years old, but is the author, already, of a number of important theological Treatises, and is engaged now upon the book of Daniel. This volume fully sustains the reputation this great work has already acquired.

Principles of a System of Philosophy; *By Austin Bierbower, A. M., New York: Carlton and Lanahan; San Francisco: E. Thomas; Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden,* 1870.

The wise man has said, "Of making many books there is no end." Many write books who have no vocation for the work. The little book here noticed discusses profound themes, such as have occupied the minds of such men as Leibnitz, Kant, Hegel, &c. Of his ability to treat them, the reader may, perhaps, be able to judge from the opening paragraph.

"We are accustomed to think that everything was created by God. There are, however, certain laws which have always existed, and so do not depend on Him for their existence, and which could not but exist, and so could not have been made different, or even be changed."

The author tries to reconcile Philosophy and Christianity—his intention is good, but the effort is weak.

Bible Gems: or Manual of Scripture Lessons. *Specially designed for Public Schools, but equally adapted for Sunday Schools and Families. By R. E. Kremer. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.* 1870.

We cordially join our commendation of this little volume to those already given. Its introduction into any of our Schools would be

followed with good results, but it would be especially desirable that it should be used in the public schools. We do not know what may be its fate in this direction. It is commended for this purpose by J. P. Wickersham, LL.D., State Superintendent of Public Instruction. If our Public Schools are to be saved from the spirit of infidelity, people must see that some instruction of this kind must be introduced into them. We hope this book may not be shut out from schools of any kind.

Ancient States and Empires: *for Colleges and Schools. By John Lord, LL.D., Author of the "Old Roman World," "Modern History," etc. New York: Charles Scribner & Company,* 1869.

With the examination we have given to this work, we are favorably impressed with its adaptedness for use in Colleges and Schools, as well as its value for private reading. It is divided into three parts. I. The Ancient Oriental Nations. II. The Grecian States. III. The Roman Empire. One peculiarity of the work is the large space it gives to those great movements in history, to which the Scriptures refer. The spirit, also, of the author, in the use he makes of Scripture, as well as that which pervades the whole work, is pervaded by a Christian tone. There are some things in the first part (which is a sort of epitome of Biblical history) which might be criticised. For instance, when the author says: "There are various geological phenomena *in all parts* of the world, which can not be accounted for on any other ground than some violent disruption produced by a *universal* deluge." Again, when he seems to link the degradation and slavery of the negro race to the curse pronounced on Canaan. But the work altogether is worthy of the favorable opinions it has received from those competent to judge, and we join in commending it as well suited for classes in the study of Ancient History.

The Life of Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D., *Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. By Henry Carrington Alexander. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner & Company.* 1870.

The only objection to this excellent biography of a great and good man, if, indeed, it be an objection, is, that the matter was not condensed into one volume. We say this, not so much because there is too much amplification, but because it would be read more generally if the matter were thus condensed. Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander was no ordinary man, and belonged to no ordinary family. He was widely known as a most accomplished scholar, and devoted Christian; but only those who moved in the circle of his personal acquaintance could estimate and appreciate him as he deserved. His early progress and proficiency in scholarship were truly remarkable. He began the study of Latin as soon as he began to read, and at ten years of age he commenced the Hebrew. Already at thirteen he

was working at Arabic. His subsequent progress in the languages is known.

The reading of such a biography must produce good effects upon all, but especially upon the young. No better book could be placed into the hands of students; though, for their sake, we would like to see it in one volume.

STUDIES IN THE GOSPELS. *By Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. New York: Charles Scribner and Company,* 1870.

The only introduction this work needs to the readers of this Review, is a statement of the subjects of which it treats. 1. The Temptation .2. The calling of Philip and Nathanael. 3. Christ and the Samaritan Woman. 4. The Sons of Thunder. 5. Wisdom Justified of her Children. 6. The Three Aspirants. 7. The New Piece on the Old Garment, etc. 8. The Transfiguration. 9. James and John offering to call fire from Heaven, etc. 10. The return of the Seventy. 11. The Pharisees seeking to scare the Lord from Galilee. 12. The Unfinished Tower, etc. 13. Zaccheus. 14. The True Vine. 15. The Penitent Malefactor. 16. Christ and the two Disciples on the way to Emmaus A volume of 325 pages. Those who have his other works, especially *ministers of the Gospel,* will desire to add yet this one, containing the Studies in the Gospels of so genial and original an author.

BIBLE ANIMALS; *Being a Description of Every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures, from the Ape to the Coral. By the Rev. J. G. Wood, M. A., F. L. S., etc. Author of "Homes without Hands;" "Common Objects of the Sea-shore and Country," etc. With one hundred new designs by W. F. Keyl, T. W. Wood and E. A. Smith. New York: Charles Scribner and Company,* 1870.

Those acquainted with the learned author of this work, need not be informed, that it is prepared with the utmost care and ability, and may be safely consulted as good authority on all the subjects of which it treats. It is not a book with a mere taking title, as having to do with the Bible. It is a truly scientific work. The style in which it is gotten up, and the designs, are in the best style. Altogether this is a book well worthy a place in every library.

ESSAY ON DIVORCE AND DIVORCE LEGISLATION, *with Special Reference to the United States. By Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner and Company,* 1869.

This volume contains six chapters, as follows: I. Divorce among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. II. Doctrine of Divorce in the New Testament. III. Law of Divorce in the Roman Empire, and in the Christian Church. IV. Divorce and Divorce Law in

Europe since the Reformation. V. Divorce and Divorce Law in the United States. VI. Attitude of the Church toward Divorce Law; Principles of Divorce Legislation.

The subject is a highly important one. The topics treated serve to show, that the author has traversed the whole field, and brought out history and facts, which will give the reader an intelligent view of the whole subject.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH *in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By K. R. Hagenbach, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Basle. Translated from the last German Edition, with Additions, By Rev. John F. Hurst, D.D.* 2 *Vols. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.*, 654 *Broadway*, 1869.

Those who are acquainted with Dr. Hagenbach's valuable contributions to theological science will be prepared to look with favor upon this work, traversing a somewhat new field. We have more written upon the remote ages of the Church, than upon its more recent history. It seems to be presumed, that we are fully conversant with the latter, or else perhaps, that it is as yet an unfinished period. The work is made up of a series of lectures, and is written in an interesting style. The translation seems to be well executed.

The author, Dr. Hagenbach, does not seem to make any effort to give the inner tendency of the Protestant Church life in these two centuries. Indeed the German writers are very little exercised on the Church Question, which excites so much attention in England and America. But why should they? They live in Germany, and their business is to delve in the mines of thought, while they have no concern whether the Church is going on right or not: what has that to do with their theories? They seem hardly to know, that there is a Church in England and America. Sometimes a page or two is devoted to the United States. In the present volumes this country is almost entirely ignored. Yet the volumes are fraught with much interest; for, after all, Germany is the heart of Protestantism, and one can study it there in pretty much all its varied and varying phases.

THE MARRIAGE OF THE KING'S SON, AND THE GUILT OF UNBELIEF: *Two Sermons, By Rev. William James, with some Memorials of his Life. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company* 770 *Broadway*, 1869.

This is a beautiful and interesting little *memorial volume* of fourteen pages. Its contents are: 1. Prefatory note; 2. Outline of Mr. James' Life. By Rev. Wm. B. Sprague; 3. View of Mr. James's character and life. By Rev. Henry Neill; 4. Letters; 5. Sermons —two, as above designated. To commemorate in a suitable manner the lives of the faithful ministers of Christ is a pious work, which must commend itself to all Christian hearts.

ILLUSTRATED LIBRARY OF WONDERS. *I. Adventures on the Great Hunting Grounds of the World. By Victor Meunier, Illustrated with twenty two wood-cuts. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.* 1869. *II. The Ingenuity of Animals, with Illustrative Anecdotes. From the French of Ernest Menault.*

Two volumes of this celebrated library. The young will rejoice to get them. They are the kind of books to put into the hands of boys and girls. They are written in a pleasing style, and furnish a rich fund of information in reference to the wonders of nature.

THE HISTORY OF ROME. *By Theodor Mommsen. Translated with the Author's Sanction and Additions, by the Rev. William P. Dickson, D. D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism, in the University of Glasgow, late Classical Examiner in the University of St. Andrew's. With a Preface by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz. New edition, in four volumes. Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner & Company,* 1869.

This greatest history of Rome yet produced, equal in learning to Niebuhr's and at the same time more popular, is here brought before the American public in a handsome dress and convenient size. The student of history, especially after having delved in the fabulous lore of Rome, will feel a peculiar interest in following one upon whom he can rely implicitly, as he separates facts from fables, and tells us the natural story of the origin and early history of the most noted people and city in the whole history of the world. It ought to find its way at once into all the libraries of our Schools and Colleges, as well as those of a private character.

Vol. II. of this truly great work has been received. It is in some respects more fascinating than the first volume. The great campaigns of Hannibal are given with such interest, that one can hardly lay down the books after commencing them before they are concluded. Everywhere, too, one feels that he is following a master, who knows how to discriminate between what is well attested, and what is of doubtful authority.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, *from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude, M.A., Late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. III. to VIII. New York: Charles Scribner and Company,* 1870.

We noticed this work in a former number of the Review. It is worthy of the favorable notices which it has received on all sides. The first publication of this work was quite as much an event as the publication of Hume's or Macaulay's Histories. The present popular edition issued by Charles Scribner and Company, brings it within the reach of a large circle of American readers. As the history progresses—the stand-point of the author becomes more and more strongly marked. To the end, the character of Henry the VIII, comes out in a much more plausible and honorable light

than we are accustomed to see it represented in history. We commend the work as one which will fasten the attention of the reader to the end.

ESSAYS ON SOME OF THE PECULIARITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. *By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. From the Seventh London Edition. Andover: Warren F. Draper, Main Street.* 1870.

A very handsome volume of about 300 pages. Its popularity is manifest from the number of editions through which these essays have passed in England. In the latter part of the volume is to be found the celebrated essay, "Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Bonaparte," from the *eleventh* London edition.

Whately is no favorite of ours, but his character as a writer, his merits and demerits, are so well known that nothing is necessary to be said on this point. The essay on Napoleon itself is worth a place in a library as a historical document to which reference is frequently made.

ESSAYS ON THE SUPERNATURAL ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY, *with special reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübingen school. By George P. Fisher, D.D., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New and Enlarged Edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., No. 654, Broadway,* 1870.

I. The Nature of the conflict of Christian Faith with skepticism and unbelief. II. The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. III. Recent discussions upon the origin of the first three Gospels. IV. Baur on parties in the Apostolic Church, and the character of the Book of Acts. V. Bauer on Ebionitism and the origin of Catholic Christianity. VI. The Mythical Theory of Strauss. VII. Strauss's Restatement of his Theory. VIII. The Legendary Theory of Renan. IX. The Critical and Theological opinions of Theodore Parker. X. An Examination of Baur and Strauss on the Conversion of Paul. XI. The Nature and Functions of the Christian Miracles. XII. The testimony of Jesus concerning Himself. XIII. The Personality of God: in reply to the Positivist and the Pantheist.

This table of contents will give some idea of the train of thought carried through these essays. It will be seen at once, that the author grapples with the most recent forms of skepticism directed against Christianity. That he brings a high degree of ability and skill to bear upon the treatment of the subject must be acknowledged. The work is certainly a valuable contribution to our recent Apologetic literature, and is eminently worthy of being studied by students of theology.

What will strike the reader of these essays, is the fact that what are now regarded as the most dangerous assaults on Christianity come from Germany. The Tübingen School lead off, and Renan

and Theodore Parker follow. It is quite natural, that the country which has given the world the most profound treatment of Christianity, and the greatest systems of Philosophy, should develop also the most dangerous attacks against our holy religion. This latter results from the former, and is a necessary consequence of that freedom of thought, which came in with the Protestant Reformation. Old traditional orthodoxy cannot rest quiet under these assaults. It is not sufficient to cry down German speculation, as was formerly the habit, especially in New England. It has been found necessary, even in the centres of Puritanism, to make an effort at least to master the great problems of thought, that have agitated and convulsed the mind of Germany during the last three centuries.

Time was, and still is, in the Roman Catholic Church, when heresy could be put down by the ban of authority. That ended the matter. Even so great a master of learning and thought, as the lamented Balmes could close his truly able and eloquent work on Protestantism and Catholicity with the remarkable words: "*As soon as the Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, shall pronounce sentence against any one of my opinions, I will hasten to declare that I consider that opinion erroneous, and cease to profess it.*" These are remarkable words, and raise the question, whether a man *can* thus consider an opinion erroneous on the mere declaration of authority, without being first convinced of his error. Whichever way this question may be decided, we have here a different principle from that of Protestantism. The words above quoted could not, at any rate, have been uttered, by Luther. "Convince me of my error, and I will change my opinion," was his utterance, and it is the utterance of Protestantism. We do not mean by this, that Protestantism rests its teaching on the authority of human reason, by any means, but it has committed itself to full freedom of thought, and it proposes to meet and vanquish error without interfering with this freedom. Hence alongside of Protestantism, and in it, have arisen those gigantic systems of modern philosophy, which assert the autonomy of the human mind in its own sphere. So also Protestantism seeks to put no ban on scientific research, even though it may be used as a weapon against Christianity itself. From all this, comes, of course, new conflict, but the victory in the end, must rest freely on the side of that supernatural revelation, which came from the same God, who has revealed Himself in the world of nature and of mind. This conflict must be expected to go on, until the last stronghold of error is broken down, and the absolute reason authenticates itself, through the last revelation in Christ, in the reason no less than in the faith of men.

We are led to feel, in reading this and similar works by English and American scholars, who delve in the rich mines of German learning, that the material thus obtained can be presented with greater

force through this reproduction, than by the German mind itself. The English mind is direct and practical. It rests not with a consciousness of having mastered error in the University, but seeks to bring the truth to bear continually in the life of the community.

Our regret is, that, in the Anglo-German institutions of the middle States, especially of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, better provision is not made to cultivate more extensively a field for which they are so well qualified. Our professors are compelled to devote all their hours to the work of the class-room, with no time to give to the world the result of their ripe studies. New England, with far less advantage, has begun to cultivate, in an earnest way, University studies. When will the strong and wealthy Reformed and Lutheran Churches found an institution sufficiently well supplied with professors, to perform the great work for philosophical and theological science, to which, by their Anglo-German character they are called?

QUARTERLIES.

The American Presbyterian Review, *January*, 1870, (*New York.*)—1. What is it to Think. 2. Sin and Suffering in the Universe. 3. The Meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York. 4. Inspiration and the Historic Element in the Scriptures. 5. Biblical Theology, with Especial Reference to the New Testament. 6. The Development of Doctrine. 7. Solomon's Song. A New Reading of its Plot. 8. New German Works. 9. Contemporary Literature. 10. Literary and Theological Intelligence.

The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review. *January*, 1870. (*New York*).—1. The History and Literature of Civil Service Reform. 2. The Early Regeneration of Sabbath-School Children. 3. The Life of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D. 4. A Fragment. What the Greeks thought of the Religion of the Jews. 5. The Reign of Law. 6. Adjourned Meetings of the General Assemblies at Pittsburg. 7. The Life of Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D 8. The Presbyterian Church—Its Position and Work. 9 Notices of Recent Publications. 10. Literary Intelligence.

The Bibliotheca Sacra. *January*, 1870. (*Andover*).—1. The Incarnation. 2. Revelation and Inspiration. 3. The Human Intellect. 4. The Progress of Truth dependent on correct Interpretation. 5. Bethesda and its Miracle. 6. The Doctrine of the Apostles. 7. Recent Theories on the Origin of Language. 8. New Studies in Egyptology. 9. Assyrian Studies—Text Books. 10. The Topography of Jerusalem. 11. Notices of Recent Publications.

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY. *January*, 1870 (*New York*). 1. Ernest Renan. 2. On the Power of Mind over Matter. 3. Holy Scripture a Divine Revelation. 4. Mathematics as an Educational Instrument. 5. The Bible better than the Œcumenical Council. 6. The Twenty-Second Psalm. 7. Inspiration of all Scripture. 8 Religious Intelligence and Notices of Recent Publications.

THE EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY. *January*, 1870 (*Gettysburg*). 1. Importance and Connection of Works and Faith. 2. The Influence of Revivals on the State of Religion. 3. Reminiscences of Lutheran Ministers. 4. Piety and Property. 5. The Greatness of Being Useful. 6. The Chinese Problem. 7. The Ascension of Christ. 8. The Question of Close Communion. 9. Christ's Prophecy of His Sufferings. 10. The Total Eclipse of the Sun of 1869. 11. Notices of New Publications.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY. *January*, 1870 (*Philadelphia*). —1. Christ's Exaltation and Second Coming. 2. Spectrum Analysis. 3. Conception of Christ and Christianity in "Ecce Homo." 4. The New Dominion. 5. Baptism in the Greek Church. 6. The True Method of Preaching. 7. Exegetical Studies. 8. Book Notices.

THE JOURNAL OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY. *December*, 1869 (*St. Louis, Mo.*). 1. The Exposition of the Science of Knowledge by Fichte. 2. Bernard's Analysis of Hegel's Æsthetics. 3. Berkeley's Doctrine on the Nature of Matter. 4. Hegel's First Principle. 5. The Problems of Philosophy at the Present Time. 6. Is Thought the Thinker? 7. Preface to Vol. III.

THE THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM. *January*, 1870 (*Nashville, Tenn.*).—1. The Necessity of a Knowledge of Ecclesiastical History to Young Men preparing for the Ministry. 2. The Atonement. 3. Preparation for the Pulpit. 4. Infant Salvation. 5. Power in the Pulpit. 6. A Right View of the Church necessary to a Right View of the Ministry. 7. Woman's Work in the Church. 8. The Bible in the Public Schools—Book Notices.

SOUTHERN REVIEW. *January*, 1870 (*Baltimore*).—1. What is Moral Science? 2. The Life of Garrick. 3. The Legend and Literature of the Wandering Jew. 4. Newton's First Law of Motion. 5. Anglo-Saxon Literature. 6. Hugh Swinton Legare. 7. The Cotton Interest. 8. The Wave Theory of Physics. 9. Scientific Ballooning. Daphles; A Poem. 10. Notices of Books.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1870.

Art. I.—ORGANIC REDEMPTION.

BY SAMUEL H. GIESY, D. D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I. The Historical Adam—Organic Ruin.

The principle of infinite multiplication of individuals is resident in every germ. A mighty forest is immanent in the yet undeveloped potentiality of the tiny acorn. The grand trunk and massive branches of the giant oak are latent there; nay, immensely more, the countless trees, onward and onward, springing from it and their products. There is thus no defining the power of reproduction shut up in the narrow limits of a single acorn.

This plastic force produces individual existences of the same kind with itself. It is ever a *self*-reproduction. "The herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit *after his kind*," (Gen. i. 11), each *species* holding permanently to its own order, (*whose seed is in itself*), was the law of the germinant principle stamped on young nature. The sprouting acorn becomes the majestic oak: then the oak-grove. The relation here is that of generic causation. Springing from one and the same seminal root, the mighty forest is an organic unit. The subsequent

creation of marine and terrene animals held alike in this self-propagation of species. There too, it was "every living creature *after his kind*," (Gen. i. 21), making each, in its indefinite extension, a generic unit after its own order.

This same law of organic unity and out-growth holds in the human, no less than in the vegetable, and animal world, mediated, however, by Personality, and moral, therefore, besides natural. The *genus homo* had a common origin, sprung from one stock and root. Like the acorn including in its tiny compass the oak and future forests, humanity in its widest range, spreading out over all portions of the habitable globe, and in all its marked diversities, physical and national, was originally comprehended in the person of the Primal Man.

The race is not *autochthonic* (*αὐτόχθων*), sprung from the soil, in different localities widely apart, nor yet from several created centres, independent of each other, accounting, as naturalists of the Agassiz school contend, thus readily for the marked varieties maintaining their permanence through unbroken centuries. Uniformly the Biblical idea recognizes, not several such independent centres, but one only, the first human pair. (Gen. i. 27; ii. 22; St. Matt. xix. 4; Acts xvii. 26; Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 45, the *first man* Adam; Eph. iv. 25, "members one of another"). The Scriptures positively know nothing of pre-Adamites.

Much less is the race *atomistic*. It is not an aggregation of separate individuals, but an organic unit; one, not as the myriad particles of a sand-heap,* with no other relation save that of local contact, but by inward constitution and nature, sharing a real community of life and feeling in springing from one and the same stock. The relation here is not outward and mechanical, but inward and transmissive, dynamic and participative, the "power of a single life" moving grandly onward with the ages. Back of and conditioning the individual, is the gen-

---

* "The whole Pelagian view of life is shallow in the extreme. It sees in the human race only a vast aggregation of particular men outwardly put together; a huge living sand-heap, and nothing more."—"*Mystical Presence*," *John W. Nevin, D.D., Philadelphia*, 1846, *p.* 164.

eral life in which it stands and of which it forms a part. "For the atomic theory of the relation of individuals to the species, Christian realism substitutes the dynamic. In contrast with Pantheism it asserts the infinite importance of individuals, their responsibility and immortality; in equally strong contrast with the superficial Deism that treats men as a heap of sand without any organic connection, it maintains the unity of the race; the tree is one, though its leaves are distinct, and the tree determines the nature of the leaves, although they only are of value."

This conception of humanity, its substantial unity as a vast organism, standing originally in the same generic headship, is essential both to a right understanding of the terrific ruin in which it was involved by the sin of the first, and the full redemption brought in by the thoroughly human and perfectly righteous life of the second, Adam. This clearly is St. Paul's idea, as will appear further on. He views the race as organically gathered up first in its natural and fallen head, and then, "in the fullness of time," re-gathered under its supernatural and redemptive Head. Neither is apprehended as *a* man simply, but *the* man; in both cases, as the generic Root and historic Stem.

This corresponds exactly with Adam's relation to the race as presented in the early Scriptures. An indication of it is given in the very title of the first book (בְּרֵאשִׁית; *Γένεσις*: Genesis,) taken from the initial word. It has to do with the first things in the material creation and humanity. It is the history of the *beginning* of the race. This beginning, like a river in its spring-head, stood in that one man. At that initial point he was the race; more than the bearer of a single individual life; that indeed, yet the general, too, under its widest form; one amongst the countless myriads since sprung from his loins, his posterity, yet more, the prolific germ. He was not *a* man simply, but *the* man. Man substantively: the race, germinally, in its longest possible duration in time, and widest expansion, in space.

The appellation divinely bestowed upon him witnesses fully to this. By his Creator he is named הָאָדָם, *i. e.* THE ADAM—THE MAN. With the definite article prefixed, the designation at once rises above all the narrowness of a proper name merely to the dignity and comprehension of a generic term, *unum in multis*, Adam in his fatherhood. Hence, in the Mosaic record, the term looks and is made inclusive of both sexes. "So God created man (הָאָדָם) in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He *them*." (Gen. i. 27). "This is the book of the generations of Adam, *i. e.* man. In the day that God created man (Adam), in the likeness of God made He him; *male and female* created He them; and blessed *them*, and called *their* name Adam, *i. e.* MAN, in the day when they were created." (Gen. v. 1, 2). In its divine bestowal, this name (Adam), including thus the woman as well as the man, carries along with it the full sense of the headship of the *primus homo*. Gesenius refers to a number of passages where it is used as a collective noun, for *men*, *mankind*, *humanity*, *the entire race*. Most appropriately, therefore, was the Primal Man, humanity's impersonation, the potentiality of the entire race, one before many, and still one though increasingly manifold, called הָאָדָם. Thus do the last stages of historic life and endeavor stand in organic connection with their fontal source, and are alike necessarily involved in all the consequences of this generic comprehension. Though Adam's life, by ordinary generation, thus flows on from that distant spring-head in one continuous and ever-widening stream, yet does it involve no loss of individuality on either side. Generic identity is not, on the part of his posterity, Adamic absorption, nor yet on his part the loss in them of entire self-hood. It is simply participation in the common life thenceforth made the moving principle of the world's history.

Hence we are far from reaching the true aim and scope of humanity in the matter of any mere corporeal propagation. By the in-breathing of a spirit, crowning from above the struggle from below upward, Adam stood immeasurably above all that had gone before in the grand creative process, and had a nobler

destiny to meet. This grander in-lying idea was human development, in the sphere of free and conscious moral activity, into the highest stage of personal being, actual impeccability,—"a state of excellence beyond the reach of fall or failure, irresistibly self-determined, without effort or hesitation to all holy affections,"—in a word, perfect holiness, in the image of which only he was made, the reality being God. This image, or Divine ideal, to which, in a free way, he was to attain, could not in the very nature of the case, be an absolute gift, a *donum superadditum*, but rather a self-acquired attribute. Such an experiment required other than mere cosmical forces: besides intellectual, the presence also of moral powers, constituting him at once the lord of all below and connecting him with the Lord of all above and the things of the unseen world.

Freedom both of choice and power, self-determined moral activity, is the condition of intelligent creatureship necessary to the attainment of the highest stage of such existence. "Take away from virtue the element of will," says Origen, "and you take away its very essence." "Voluntas quæ potest cogi et cogitur," Luther says, "non est voluntas sed noluntas." Where obedience is to be other than blind impulse, as the planet fast-bound to its orbit; or mere instinct, as the animal following, age after age, with not the slightest variation, the constitution originally impressed upon it, like bees making honey, there must be intelligence and will holding freely in the office and under the laws of conscience. Ruled by these higher powers man transcends while he stands in nature. He is more than body. "There is a *spirit* in man." He is the meeting-point of the cosmical and the spiritual, "the free personal unity of spirit and nature;" and, "as the free organ for the holy Will of the Creator,"* his vocation was to lift up by self-choice, this freedom to its highest ideal by accepting and making that will the rule of his own life. Hence, unconstrained self-surrender to the Divine Will is true freedom. "Only such a man," says Delitzsch, "is truly free, for he is free as God is, because he

* Martensen's Dogmatics, Edinburgh Ed., p. 138.

is free in God." But this capacity of voluntary obedience to God is at the same time the capacity of voluntary bondage to "that which is foreign to God." The power of will is of necessity also the power of *self*-will, which is the possibility of sin—self-action in the wrong direction, a possibility which should have remained such alone, and never passed into actualized sinfulness. This will-power, man's near approach to God-likeness, was his highest dignity and honor, as it undoubtedly was his greatest peril, and in the end proved, in its fearful perversion, the sad ruin of himself and race.*

Moving thus in the sphere of personality, the relation of Adam to his posterity goes deeper than that of the acorn and the wider forest. Like all similitudes from the lower sphere of mere nature-forces, it fails to set forth the full truth in the case. There is the power here of transmitting not only his somatic-psychical nature, but all that his ethical being is made by his

---

* Since writing the above, the admirable work of Monsell, "Religion of Redemption," has come into my hands, from which I make the following pertinent quotation: "But since creation in the image of God included moral freedom, man was called upon to become by his own choice that which he already was virtually by the Divine appointment. As each particular act of human life becomes moral only by being voluntary, still more must its general primitive determination. God is what He is by His own eternal choice, and man could only reproduce His image by willingly becoming like Him, by his own voluntary development of the capacity of moral excellence. He was created his own master that he might give himself unto God. It was his privilege and his peril to be the child in his Father's house, capable of yielding willing obedience, and for that very reason capable also of refusing his allegiance, and turning away from his destined blessing and supreme good. *Determinable* to either good or evil, he was not yet *determined*. To create man free was to give him the power of realizing or forfeiting his liberty; it was a summons to make himself *actually*, what he was *potentially*, and by the deliberate agreement of his will with that of God, to take possession of his own being, to constitute his moral personality. 'God created man as little as possible,' says St. Bonnet, meaning thereby that we were endowed with the germ and crude capacity of that state for which we were intended, but that the exercise of our freedom was necessary to raise us up to the positive attainment of the dignity and bliss of perfect moral being. Mere animal natures are finished from the first. God took everything that concerned them upon Himself, and left them nothing to do, but it was His will that man should be His fellow-worker in the great feat of His own creation, and thereby in the completion of all creation; the Father left the mighty work unfinished, so to speak, until the child should set his seal upon it."—*A Contribution to the Preliminaries of Christian Apology; By R. W. Monsell, B. A. London*, 1867, *pp.* 9, 10.

own full consent and activity. In this regard, what the headman becomes stays not with himself, but acquires at once universal significance and generic effect. His perpetuation is a self-perpetuation, not, indeed, of his separate personality, but, in its deepest power, what Delitzsch calls, his "spiritual-psychical-somatic nature" (in this way of putting it, following the order of the fall itself, *sweeping from the higher through the lower*), with all the disturbances, the sundering of his proper relation to God, or all the benefits, its steadfast maintenance, carried with it. "Primeval man found himself in circumstances from which human nature was to issue perfected or corrupt, his formal freedom disappearing and passing over into a holy, or else a selfish and perverse will." The son of Adam bears Adam's "image." He is like him because he was *in* him and is *of* him.

"A whole world of alike separate personalities," says Dr. Nevin, "lay involved in his life, as a generic principle and root. And all these, in a deep sense, form at last but one and the same life. Adam lives in his posterity, as truly as he has ever lived in his own person. They participate in his whole nature, soul and body."* "The perversion of principles," says Martensen, "which took place in the first Adam had a moral bearing upon the entire organism which has in him not only its historical, but also its natural starting-point. . . . Individuals and races are organic points in that sum total of development, which has its starting-point in the first Adam, and they by nature repeat the Adamic type. Every individual begins from his birth an abnormal development of life whose universal characteristic is the conflict between the flesh and the spirit."† St. Augustin puts the same thing thus: "We were all in that one man, when he, though being but one, corrupted all. . . . That form in which we were severally to live had not yet been created and distributed to each, but the seminal nature from

---

* *Mystical Presence, p.* 161.

† *Christian Dogmatics, p.* 174.

which we were to spring had been."* Monsell, in the work already referred to, says, "Every other sinner is the organ of a sinful nature, but the first sinner determined the corruption of that nature. As the schoolmen put it: in Adam's case, *persona corrumpit naturam;* in ours, *natura corrumpit personam.* That first fatal step determined a whole career of degradation, every moment of which was contained in the first."

It follows, that Adam was not the *occasion* simply of "sin and death" in the human world. His relation here was not pedagogic, of one order with a bad leadership; the first example in sin after which all since have so sadly patterned. How utterly impossible is it on any such merely incidental and tuitional theory to account for the facts of our fallen life, not only the universal sinfulness of the race, but its *pre*-conscious as well as *sub*-conscious manifestations!

Nor was his relation here simply a legal or representative one. Adam stood for man in very reality, not in point of law merely: *de facto*, not alone *de jure*. Its generic head, and not its legal representative simply, the race, in his failure, *was made* a race of sinners, and not, according to Dr. Hodge's view, in an outward and forensic way only to be "*regarded and treated as sinners.*"† His sin does not, like the poisoned shirt of Nessus, touch and envelop the race in any merely tactual sense, but the virus is ingrained in our very nature, and so transmitted from generation to generation; is not an extrinsic appendage, but an intrinsic power; not a mere imitation grown into the habit of evil, *sed necessitas per traducem;* in a word, a generic condition. "By *nature*," St. Paul says, "the children of wrath," which, if it means anything sets forth an actual participation in Adam's fallen nature, and makes his relation to the "sin and death" of his posterity dynamic, not accidental; impartative, not imputative only; communicative, through the Devil, of this abnormal element, not alone representative.

---

* *Omnes enim fuimus in illo uno, quando omnes ille unus corrupit. . . . . Nondum erat nobis sigillatim creata et distributa forma, in qua singuli viviremus, sed jam natura erat seminalis, ex qua propagaremur.*

† *Commentary on Romans.*

This other and fuller statement of the same Apostle is directly to the point: "By *one man* sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." (Rom. v. 12). This "one" is directly charged with being the *cause* of that corruption of nature under which the race has ever since labored and groaned.

In exegetical pugilism nothing has gone beyond what this passage has occasioned. Open to objections at every point, and of all, the least satisfactory is the legalistic or representative theory, of which Dr. Hodge is by far the ablest advocate.* In his recent exhaustive "*Analytic Commentary on Romans*," Rev. Dr. Forbes cuts up this theory by the roots. "We are one with Adam," he says, "not by mere outward appointment, by which his sin is counted our sin, but by inward constitution, according to which Adam could beget a son only in his own corrupted image, that, which is born of the flesh being necessarily flesh. He was the root of humanity, between whom and the branches a connection subsisted of the most intimate nature, so that the corruption admitted into the stock by the one fatal act of Adam immediately and necessarily communicated itself to every branch connected with him. Sin is personified as a principle or active power, which entered into human nature at once in its corrupting and condemning power. We are not therefore sinners only by imputation, but sin is a living, active principle inherent in the child, which shows its real existence, as soon as he becomes capable of any moral act."

This conception of an organic ruin finds symbolic expression in the First Part of the Heidelberg Catechism. Broadly it asserts the corruption of our *entire nature* and the *entire race* in the corruption of the *primal headship*, over against Pelagian notions of every kind, where sin is apprehended only as an incidental and tuitional thing, the imitation of a bad example,

* In vain has the Princeton Review, in a recent article mainly in reply to Dr. Schaff's *Addenda* to Dr. Lange's Commentary on Romans, endeavored to relieve it of some of these objections. They are insuperable. They hold against the mechanical conception in which the whole theory rests; and every such attempt is only making its confusion worse confounded.

and therefore, something which may be surmounted by the individual will alone. In the answer to the *seventh question* this is very fully and clearly stated, where part in Adam's nature, by the ordinary process of generation, is held to be each one's conception and birth in sin.* The ruin is thus felt, and owned to be broader and deeper than the individual life, comprehending the common life of the race, and to such an extent, indeed, that there is no power of *self-recovery*.

By this, however, it is not meant, that nothing good is left in man, dispossessed of all spiritual susceptibility, and wholly incapable of any Godward impulse, or good purpose, thinking a good thought, or doing a good act. The fall has not had the effect of *destroying* man's will as such, throwing him back into the sphere and operation of mere nature-forces. It still exists with all its essential elements, a power still in the direction of good and capable of good, only not in such a sense that man can thereby extricate himself or redeem himself, but in such a sense, as freely to link himself with the scheme of supernatural grace. Breaking away from his proper allegiance, he has not become essentially evil, but, by his own free act and consent, has come under a spiritual domination in the opposite direction. The *theonomy*, which was the true ideal, has become a false *autonomy*, leaving him without ability, apart from redemption, ever to attain his true personality, or realize the Divine ideal. "It is not *receptivity*, but the *productivity* which is wanting to the natural man."†

Had the fall made his nature *essentially* evil, he would have become Satanic, and so past redemption. Fallen he is, but not brutal, nor yet devilish. Not brutal: under the power absolutely of mere nature-forces, alike indifferent to good and evil, and capable of neither. Conscious discrimination and decision are the necessary factors of moral obligation. The consciousness

---

* "*Whence then comes this depraved nature of man? From the fall and disobedience of our first* parents, Adam and Eve, *in Paradise, whereby* our nature became so corrupt, that we are *all* conceived and born in sin." *Tercentenary Ed.* 1863.

† Martensen's Christian Dogmatics, p. 180.

of freedom and the sense of responsibility are inseparable from the idea of criminality. Hence with the moral incapacity of the brute, brutal irresponsibility must follow, and, murdering a fellow-being, a man would be no more open to criminal proceedings than the ferocious dog that tears a child to pieces. The fall wrought no such subversion of man's original constitution. It was no such *brutalizing* process. The will remains still a *human* will.

Nor yet devilish: under the power absolutely of evil; doing naught but evil; consciously and perpetually committed to it. Such is the Satanic nature, essentially and only evil. Satan is the personal enemy of God: a fiendish power arrayed in deadly hostility against Him. Good here was not simply overthrown, but dethroned, and implacable hatred and unrelenting malignity enthroned, reigning in absolute usurpation. He is as fast-bound in evil as, awaiting the judgment of the great day, he is held "in everlasting chains under darkness." Nay, his damnation is thus hopelessly sealed because his nature is wholly and irretrievably evil. But the fall of man was no such *demonizing* process; entailed no such posture of insuperable obduracy and defiance.

Well is it, that with our poor, human nature it is otherwise; not thus essentially and wholly evil. Fallen it is under the abnormal power of sin, but not fettered and bound as with adamantine chains. The will is not fast-bound in evil. The bias withal setting strongly and steadily in the wrong direction, yet has it still the power to choose between good and evil; in spite of good to choose evil, and in spite of evil to choose good. This image of God is marred and mutilated, but not utterly effaced. It is not, like the visual organ of the eyeless fish of the underground river of the Mammoth Cave, a faculty of our being dropped out and wholly extirpated by reason of its wrong exercise. This capacity for God and good is not removed. Conscience is still the same active and wide-awake monitorial sovereign, seated on the throne of our inner being, unsparingly condemning whatever to it seems wrong, and as quick to approve and lead on in whatever in the same way seems right. Thus though

fallen, yet, amid the general wreck, a feeling for good and a reaching after God, as the only true centre of human life and happiness, still remain, stirring even the great out-lying heathen world, ignorantly "*feeling after Him*, in whom we live, and move, and have our being."

It is in this feature of man's fallen nature we find both the possibility of and his capacity for redemption. And here, too, we discover the ground as well as the internal preparation from below for the Incarnation. For this there must be some essential congruity in the nature to be assumed, some meeting-point for the yearning coming up from below and the answering power coming down from above. In the absolute opposition of the Satanic nature to God, there was no such point of contact and union, and hence, utterly incapable of redemption. Here were the two poles: Supreme and Absolute Good, on the one hand; Supreme and Absolute Evil, on the other: Darkness set against Light.

It was widely different with fallen human nature. While the primal sin of Satan and of man had this feature in common, a departure from God, the broadest distinction obtained as to the circumstances of the actors, and, therefore, its effect in each case. With the perfect consciousness of a pure spirit falling untempted,*—for, being beyond material influences, and there being no created intelligences in the universe beside the angelic, an external temptation was not possible,—from the immediate presence of God, whom he dared to rival, henceforth Satan's opposition is the "insuperable intensity of self-induration." Not the

* In his "Yesterday, To-day and For-Ever," speaking of Lucifer's high position, the chief of the angelic hierarchs, Bickersteth thus clothes this thought:

"Unfallen
He stood, though not unwavering, when the Son
Placed in his hand the sceptre of a world.
That crowning gift determined his resolve.
Then wherefore placed He it? Brother, He foreknew
That arch imperial will, crown'd or uncrown'd,
Would yield spontaneous and spontaneous fall
Untempted, unpersuaded, unseduced
Save by itself, chafing because controll'd,
And finite amid God's infinitudes."

mere turning *away* from God was the summit of Satan's sin, but the malignant turning, consciously and perpetually, *against* Him, as *the* essential opposite. Man, a spirit-embodied being, was seduced from his allegiance to God by an adroitly presented temptation. Under the instigation of the Devil, the first in apostasy, turning from God, man, too, turns to evil, but it is not the soul and essence of his being; amid the mournful ruins this, we have seen, remains,—a Godward aspiration and movement. "Through their fall," says Delitzsch, "men had fallen into the power of Satan, without being able by their own help to deliver themselves thence; but they were not froward in their position changed as it was by sin; but they were ashamed of it, and afraid, certainly indications that they had not become absolutely Satanic."*

Entering thus an abnormal element into our nature, and constituting the ingrained principle of our whole fallen life, sin necessarily touches our being at its very inception. It is polluted in its very spring-head. The roots of depravity are hidden in the mysteries of the child's womb-life. It is, therefore, not only a *pre-conscious*, but a *pre-natal* principle. David correctly finds the cause of his flagrant sin, not in its immediate occasion, but the organic corruption of our nature. "Behold," he says, "I was *shapen* in iniquity; and in sin did my mother *conceive* me." The Psalmist's meaning is involved neither in obscurity nor uncertainty. As might readily be shown from parallel passages, the Hebrew words, translated "*shapen*" and "*conceive*," refer to a point of being anterior altogether to a separate personal existence. Birth presupposes a hidden, embryonic life, the point of its struggle and endeavor. The *pre-* and *sub*-natal life is the life of one and the same being. In all its consequences, immediate and far-reaching, David felt and owned this. Hence, in tracing back his sin, he stops not with the hour of his birth. Consciously the roots of his life, and of necessity, the roots of sin go deeper. Though not an essential, yet depravity, in his painful conviction, is the generic principle of

* *Biblical Psychology*, Edinburgh Ed., p. 154.

human nature; and so he directly connects his sin with the earliest period of his existence *in utero*, where it rooted itself mysteriously in the life of another.

Participation in a ruined nature makes every child a sinner. By this, it is not meant that the child, as now born, is a sinner "after the similitude of Adam's transgression." He was a voluntary and intelligent actor. This the child is not, and cannot act as he did before maturity. But it inherits his depravity, and comes into the world under the force of this organic disturbance and disorder. And this holds alike true of children, whether born *in* or *beyond* the bosom of the pious family. In both cases we have *original* sin, and, therefore, an actual transfer made necessary into the sphere of objective grace—"deliverance from the power of the Devil." And yet the Christian family, standing already in this supernatural order, is organically not the same as a family wholly in the bosom of the world. Here is the Covenant with all its prevenient grace, in real and active, though silent, force.

Whatever you may call it—spiritual receptivity, or faculty for grace—Christian birth makes already an organic difference. Hence, where only one parent is Christian, the child is pronounced "holy." How? Not certainly as being lifted thereby out of the generic corruption of our nature; nor yet as possessing full Christian character, or even all that is needed for this, but only as being more favorably conditioned towards Christianity. In the deep sense and meaning of the word itself, the child, in Covenant *relations*, thereby stands inwardly related to the order of life above fallen nature. This faculty *for* grace is not by any means that grace itself; nor can it, by any process of natural development or moral culture *ab extra*, reach or generate that grace, any more than the soul of man, although inwardly related to and a faculty for the infinite, could, in and of itself, have risen to it. In some way it is an internal fitness and base for that which coming down from above meets and answers it. Hence, its significance and spiritual importance—the meeting-point of the birth from beneath and the birth from above: the Holy Spirit, through Baptism, completing and

crowning this gracious susceptibility with the actual contents of that higher order to which it aspires.

We have, as just hinted, a prefigurement of something of this kind in the very constitution of our being. Biblical Psychology throughout recognizes and teaches this tripartite division—body, soul, and spirit. The soul, the intermediate part, is the faculty for the infinite—that point of his being where man is joined to God and the invisible world, but with no capacity in himself to reach and realize it. Nature coming in his earth-framed body to its climax, needs itself to be complemented and crowned by that which lies wholly beyond the soul, and not, of course, within the power of its production. Necessarily there is just here a new movement from the creative centre. To this glorious culmination of all nature below—this "temple of the soul," this "shrine of intelligence"—God's in-breathing communicates the informing and undying spirit. With no power to produce it, nor reach it, the soul forms the meeting-point of the process from below and the Creative Spirit from above, and for which, in its vast powers going beyond everything that hitherto had appeared, it was itself constituted.

And the constitution of Christ's person affords a still higher illustration of the same thing. The human is inwardly related to the Divine nature, and aspires to union with it; but even with a constitutional fitness for it, it has no power in and of itself to reach and realize it. The God-man, an actual and mysterious fact in the Incarnation, was no product, by any means, of mere human forces. Christ was the New Creation—the Divine by a fresh act, in a personal form, linking itself to and standing, in living and indissoluble unity, in the bosom of the human. More of this hereafter. It is introduced here only as an illustration of what we are aiming to show,—namely, that birth of Christian parents involves already an order of life above that of mere natural birth, and carries along with it decided advantages and a real claim to grace in a positive supernatural form, although, in the utter prostration and confusion of our nature, without power in itself to fulfil and make all this good.

This much necessarily, or the Christian family, with the presence of Original Sin, fully conceded and felt, is nothing in advance of the family standing wholly and purely in the bosom of nature. Even the Old Covenant was felt to work already a decided advantage in this particular. Why not then, where "grace doth much more abound?" The whole pre-Christian history of redemption shows this to have been the case. Judaistic birth was in the order of a *family election;* but an election not complete in and of itself. It was prospective. Its real spiritual advantages were, in the way of actual appropriation, to be made good by timely compliance on the part of each parent, for his own child, with the divine institution of Circumcision. This made the previous family election a divine election also. Hence, it is easily seen, there was in the nature of the Jewish child already a constitutional fitness for and relation to the higher kingdom; all of which, however, would have gone for nothing had God's holy ordinance been neglected and despised. In his own forcible way of putting things, St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans (iii. 1—4), thus brings out this decided advantage of the Jew over the Gentile, however the latter, especially the Greek and Latin nations, stood far above the former in education and culture: "What advantage, then, hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? *Much every way:* chiefly that unto them were committed the oracles of God,"—*the whole supernatural order.* "For *what if some did not believe?* shall *their unbelief* make the *faith of God without effect?* God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."

If all this now held in the sphere of *promise* merely, necessarily much more in the sphere of actual grace. The family is an organism. Children are organic parts of it, as much so as the branch is of the vine. Here, natural qualities—physical, intellectual and moral—are transmitted. The Christian family is a Christian family organism. Here, too, children are organic parts. As such, they are necessarily different to some extent from the first.*

* In his able contribution to the 'TERCENTENARY MONUMENT," entitled "THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF RELIGION UNDERLYING THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM," Dr. Gans has brought out fully and clearly this organic relation of the covenanted family to the higher sphere of actual grace, (pp. 456—70.)

And besides the natural organs, mental powers and moral faculties, the child inherits also a gracious susceptibility, and which in the way of preparation from below for that which is absolutely needed from above, constitutes, as in the Old, so in the New Covenant, a decided advantage, and carries along with it a full right and title to it. But as in the former case, so here also, it is easily seen that this receptive capacity or fitness springs not from nature (Pelagian), but from grace organically through the order of the Christian family. There is here no room for any Pelagian boast of merit. It is all of God, even as natural life, in this lower generic constitution, is wholly of God.

Nor is this prevenient gracious susceptibility enough in itself. It cannot generate the grace of which it is no more than a prophecy and anticipation, and to which it aspires. Withal, it is not saving. The oldest and best theologians never so regarded it. Even Calvin never taught that the covenanted child possessed from this source alone all that is necessary for a complete Christian character, and that Baptism was no more than the outward formal confirmation of the grace already at hand, as is now so stoutly claimed in certain quarters. Inconsistent as his system is in some particulars, you cannot charge upon it any such solecism and self-contradiction as this. With him the covenant relation was no figment, yet it looked only to the positive contents of grace in Baptism, opening favorably to what is saving in that.

Though a child by Christian birth is thus inwardly related to the regenerative grace coming from the Holy Ghost, "the Lord and Giver of Life," yet, must it, through Baptism, as the divine institution for the counter action of its birth-sin, be put into the sphere of actual grace. The sacramental act of Baptism must thus complement and crown all below. Its neglect, as the neglect of Circumcision, in the former case, works the vitiation and waste of all that prevenient advantage, as, indeed, subsequent indifference at any point to the obligations and privileges of the Baptismal relation itself, is the complete and sad forfeiture of all to which it gives a full and proper title.

This, and no more, we conceive to be the status of the chil-

dren of Christian parents prior to Baptism, in the sense of the Heidelberg Catechism. They are in the Covenant, *i. e.* the Christian community. But being in the Covenant is, by no means, one and the same with being in actual contact with grace under its saving form. It only looks to that, and must be met by that. Being in the Christian community is not one and the same with being in the Communion of the Church. The Church, as the supernatural constitution where the grace of regeneration and redemption is actually present in the world, is necessarily a narrower idea than that of the Christian community.* There is in the language of the Catechism, at this point, neither vagueness nor contradiction. It means just what it says, and says just what it means. It says, the children of Christian parents *belong*, *i. e.* are *related* to the Covenant; or, putting it in another form, are covenantly comprehended "in the people of God," and *because* thus included, have a *birth*-right to sacramental incorporation into the Church itself—the Mystical Body of Christ. It, therefore, goes on to say, that for this very reason they are to be constituted members, and thus made sharers of the grace, which there, and there only, actually holds in the world. "For since they, as well as their parents, *belong to* the Covenant and people of God, * * * * * they are also by Baptism, as a sign of the Covenant, to be *ingrafted*† into the Christian Church, and dis-

* Dr. Harbaugh has brought out fully and satisfactorily this broad distinction, in an article in this Review (1867,) entitled "THE OLD DISTINCTION BETWEEN GEMEINDE AND KIRCHE." This distinction is plainly maintained in the first English translation of Ursinus' Comentary on the Catechism. In a copy presented to me by my esteemed friend, Dr. Krauth, of the Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, translated by Dr. Henry Parry, Oxford, 1601, is the following: "Baptisme is instituted to be a token and symbole of our *receiving and entrance into the Church.* For these are opposed and contradictory, To bee, and *not to be* in the Church; *To enter*, and *not to enter* into the Church. For God will have all the *citizens of his Church* thus enfranchised; and those who are not baptized when they may, *He will not have reckoned in the number of His Church.*" (p. 726). In the Latin Edition, 1634, also in my possession, an abridgment evidently of the original work, the intermediate clause is omitted, as it is also in the English translation of Dr. Williard. The Commentary, at many points, is involved in flat self-contradiction if this plain distinction is disregarded.

† "They are by Baptisme to bee *ingrafted* into the Church of God," old translation by Dr. Parry, 1601, p. 735, and not as according to the version in common use, "They must by Baptism be also *admitted*," &c.

tinguished from the children of unbelievers.* In the first instance, the German word is "*gehörin;*" in the second, "*einverleibt*"—two ideas altogether different. In the Latin translation the same broad distinction is carefully preserved—*pertinent, pertain to*, designating the first; *inserendi sunt*, the second, from, *insero, to sow or plant in, to ingraft, insert the sprig of one tree in the stock of another*. Hence, both according to the original German and the early Latin translation, it was clearly not enough for the child by its birth simply of Christian parents to "belong" or *pertain to* "the Covenant and people of God." And so far from Baptism being regarded as the confirmation only of any prevenient grace, the Catechism insists that the child shall be made a Christian child by being put *in* the actual constitution of grace, which *in-being* is only possible by sacramental incorporation. Hence the significance and stress laid on Infant Baptism.

Sharing alike by sinful conception and birth in the generic ruin, this hereditary principle of physical and moral disturbance is found making itself seen and felt from the very first, claiming thus, from this earliest moment, the real, active presence, also of the antagonizing and transcending principle of the New Creation. Any work of recovery, to be at all complete, must lay hold of our nature at the very point where sin first touches it. All this, then, in the way of inward prophecy and actual necessity, looks to a scheme of Redemption of a like organic character, following in its transcending power, the very order of our fallen life—the principle of Righteousness and Life in a generic form over against the principle of sin and death.

We see this principle of disharmony in all periods and relations of human life. The oak lies inwrapped in the acorn. In the very early putting forth of its hidden life, it does not bear acorns: but it is its nature to do so, and will do so when sufficiently grown. And so all the powers of sin are inherent in the child. Though free from actual sin, it is in the nature of

* *Tercentenary Edition*, p. 207.

the child to sin, and, with the unfolding of its powers, comes, by its own free volition, into disobedience. And how is the power of sin seen and felt to become more mischievous and pernicious as the natural development goes forward. So far from "increase in wisdom and stature" (St. Luke, ii. 52,) being progress in divine favor and parental complacency, it is an increase of parental anxiety and progress in evil. The child here is but father to the man. Ripening manhood shows us life generally self-centered and self-ordered, working out, in most cases, its worst ends.

All human relations, too, show the workings of this disorganizing principle. In the family we have already seen it to be a principle of self-will and disobedience. But all civil and ecclesiastical, share, alike with domestic and social, relations, in the general disorder consequent upon sin; in the State, engendering tumult and riot, sedition and rebellion, the violation of law and the resistance of authority; in the Church, heresy and schism, contempt of the Holy Sacraments and disregard of the Divine Word, general unbelief, and the denial mainly that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh."

Sin, in like way, is the principle of physical disorganization. The divine prohibition was: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely *die*"—a process looking to the total dissolution of the body in the grave, and the certain issue of human life under every form. Death wears the iron visage of a tyrant, and executes his mandates with remorseless rigor. He spares no age; neither the helpless babe, nor its maternal dependence. The crowned head fares here no better than the meanest subject. Among the dying words of the great Daniel Webster, were these: "One may live as a conqueror, a king, or a magistrate, but he must die as a man." All ages and distinctions are swallowed up, and lost in the same low and oblivious burial.

> "There all are equal. Side by side
> The poor man and the son of pride
> Lie calm and still."

The vanity of the race in this regard is generic. Sharing a common nature, we share also a common fate. Hence, from

every side the old wail of Moses (Psalm xc. 3–6) still comes. Adam sinned and died, and the race in its death-stricken head. The law of death acquired, and maintains with the law of sin alike generic character and force. They are twin-born evils. They entered the world together, and pass together down the ages. (Rom. v. 12). The headstone at the grave of the Antediluvian world bears the epitaph of each succeeding generation: "*And he died.*"*

But this law of death by sin goes beyond all physical malady culminating here. Its desolating power touches the whole man, involving an endless destiny of misery beyond the grave. "Death" and "Life" are the most comprehensive words in the Bible. "The wages of sin is *death.*" (Rom. vi. 23.) The *Θάνατος*, in which sin at length fully issues, called elsewhere *ὁ δεύτερος Θάνατος*, in this passage, is made to be commensurate with the "Life" brought in by Jesus Christ," with which it is put in contrast, and declared to be *eternal—ζωὴ αἰωνος*. All schemes of thought moving in the sphere of *restorationism*, approximate or remote, are clearly unscriptural and anti-Christian.

Besides, moral character is itself immortal and immutable. It is solemnly declared to be fixed and unalterable. (St. Luke xvi. 26). There is no transition, on the part of those dying in sin, to the happiness and glory of those who have lived and died in Christ; no power to produce the indispensable spiritual aptitude, and, therefore, every hope of restoration to God's favor

---

* "Not to thy eternal resting place,
Shalt thou retire alone. * * * * *
Thou shalt lie down
With patriarchs of the ancient world, with kings,
The powerful of the earth, the wise and good,
Fair forms and hoary seers of ages past,
All in one mighty sepulchre. The hills,
Rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun; the vales,
Stretching in pensive quietness between;
The venerable woods, rivers that move
In majesty, and the complaining brooks,
That make the meadows green, and poured round all,
Old ocean's gray and melancholy waste—
Are but the solemn decorations all
Of the great tomb of man."

and glorious presence is the vainest delusion. In no case is the development other than what is contained potentially in the germ. "That which is born of the flesh," we have just seen, "is flesh," having no power in and of itself to reach the sphere of the Spirit. Its development is necessarily along its own line. So here. The earthly determines the eternal being. The future life is the eternal side of one and the same moral character. Whatever expansion of spiritual capacities there may be, it is in the same moral order always, not into something higher or radically different. In the chapter closing the volume of Divine Revelation there comes from the eternal throne this unequivocal announcement as to the permanence of immoral character: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still."

As far as the present discussion has been carried, two things have been determined: the absolute need of help beyond all that is within the compass of poor human nature in order to transcend the inhering corruption with all its consequences; and its fitness still for the actual presence of that transcendent help in personal union with the Divine. So far fallen is it, that no stimulation merely to self-culture, pushed to its very utmost, (Pelagianism) will serve to bring it ultimately beyond the power of sin and death. The fall is more than a shock from which recovery is seen to be readily within its own power. It is not so far fallen as, fast-bound in sin, to be incapable of redemption, save by a reconstruction *de novo*. (Manicheism). Desperate as the case certainly is, no new natural creation is needed; nor would such meet its requirements. The substitution of something entirely new would be the destruction, not the redemption, of the old. Because not evil essentially, there remains a fitness for the assumption of the human into the Divine nature, constituting for the race, in the unity of one Person, a new probation in an infallible Headship, and so making room for a redemption, of a like organic character and force with the fall, in a Second Adam.

Art. II.—CASPAR SCHWENKFELD AND THE SCHWENKFELDERS.

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, A. M., PENNSBURG, PA.

Just seven years ago, I attended the Anniversary Festival of the Schwenkfelders—a Colony of "Pennsylvania Germans." It is annually observed on the 24th of September, alternately in the "Upper" or "Lower" district of their territory, which embraces, according to their own annalist, "the upper, middle, and lower end of Montgomery, the lower end of Berks, and the south corner of Lehigh Counties"—the only settlement of Schwenkfelders in the State, the Union, or the wide World. They are no modern sect, however, but date their origin from the Reformation days, whilst their Pennsylvania history already extends back over a century and a quarter. Their circumscribed limits and historical stagnancy are owing to other causes, to be presently noted.

Whoever is not Providentially prevented, is religiously bound to attend their yearly Reunion. Neither has it been found necessary, thus far, to enter an urging statute upon the "Protokol," to secure the presence of the Fraternity. The 'seeding' is done; the corn stands in shocks, and the farm-work of the September month is timely put aside, in order that all may participate in the memorial ceremonies of the 24th, with a light, gay and thankful heart. It is on the day and day-before, that you may feast your eyes on many a well-ladened carriage and horse, or carriage and two horses—all in good condition—moving on towards one of the Schwenkfelder Meeting Houses, selected in rotation, and one whole year in advance. The aged and infirm, of both sexes, stay not behind. The young men and women are largely and promptly there. The Fathers are similarly enough clad to be considered *uniformed*. So, too, are the Mothers arrayed in a manner very like to one another, with

snow-white caps, and bonnets that never vary. The sons and daughters do indeed not love the habits of their elders any the less, yet only the wicked world's a little more. Still, whatever disposition to *romance* they may betray, there is always a certain something clannish to be discerned, in the young no less than in the old,—the straight hair down the forehead—the 'household' brogue—the tidy caps—some sign or badge of the Order of Schwenkfeld. Only their carriages, horses and harness are no longer, and in the least Schwenkfeldian. Time was when these too were such—in the days of white-covered wagons and Conestoga teams. But now, alas!—far from orthodox, they are springed, varnished and silvered; sleeked, tasseled and Yankee-collared; mounted, gilted, and even white-stitched—all, very like what the uninitiated, wild, young worldling covets and is bound to have.

The Morning Service opens at 9 o'clock, and is filled out with singing, praying, and recitals of portions of their ancestral history, foisted into the two anniversary addresses. All is gone through with in the Pennsylvania German dialect, but, withal, reverentially, solemnly and earnestly—just as though it were newly and for the first time done. The exercises are the same from year to year, but the interest flags not, nor does the spirit of worship grow weary.

At 12 o'clock the Noon-day Feast is set. This is *the* feature of the day—and singular enough to merit a description. It consists of light and newly-baked rye-bread, sweet and handsomely printed butter, and the choicest apple-butter. Nothing beyond these is set before—but *these* are of the first water. The bare benches, but lately occupied by devout worshipers, now serve as tables, along which the guests are lined out. Every one helps himself to a good 'sluice' round the large loaf, and, with his own or borrowed knife, gives it a double spread, 'laid on rather thick.' Not in silence nor in sullenness do they eat their simple meal; but, spicing it with cheerful talk, they dine with hearts full of joy. Still, you need fear no profane utterance or silly jest. They are mindful of the spirit of the occasion, of the place in which they congregate, and of the feast it-

self, which the singing of some familiar hymn has consecrated. If any one thirst, let him drink cold water.

And now, think not that they simply feign to eat and drink—that the meal, from first to last, is but a poor pretense. A full and hearty dinner is 'made out' there. It is a *bona fide* eating and drinking that is done in the meeting-house of the Schwenkfelders, on their "*Gedächtniss Tag.*" They are all hard-working men and women—farmers and farmers' wives, and farmers' children. They are sun-burnt, healthy and hungry, besides. And why should they not relish the sweet bread, with their sweet butter and apple-butter, then? Even strangers, who attend and are hospitably entertained by the Society, show that one can be "*gute zu Fuse unter der Nasse*"—i. e., can make a full hand even at such a table.

At 2 o'clock the tables become pews again, and the Afternoon Exercises are conducted according to the programme of the morning. These concluded, a general invitation is again extended to partake of the baskets-full of fragments, gathered up and stored away in the rear of the meeting-house. A fraternal hand-shaking closes the Anniversary for the year. The reflection, that many part now, who may never meet again on earth, causes not a few tears to trickle down some furrowed cheek, which generally proves more or less contagious, as is always the case, in a company of hearts, when those tears flow in sincere channels. Hence, though all were happy all day long, they now look sad.

To appreciate the meaning and spirit of this apparently homely scene, it is necessary to know, that it is a *Memorial* service all through. It was on this very 24th day of September, A. D. 1734, at mid-day, that some seventy families of Schwenkfelders, who had landed on the 22d and declared their allegiance on the 23d, held their Thanksgiving service, in gratitude to God for a safe deliverance to the Colony of Pennsylvania. They had arrived in the ship "St. Andrew," at Philadelphia, as penniless fugitives from Silesia. Poor, but feeling rich in view of their long-sought liberty, they blessed God in an open assembly. We may judge their store and fare to have been scant and

lean indeed; and to perpetuate the original service of their forefathers, from generation to generation, they statedly celebrate their *Gedächtniss Tag.* The poor fare before them is finely designed to impress the sore fact of their ancestors' poverty indelibly upon their minds, memories and hearts. They eat and drink in remembrance of former days—the days of small things. They join thereto, at the same time, a gladsome worship, in thankfulness for the asylum opened up for them, from their former house of bondage, and which proved so fair a heritage to their people ever since.

Remembering now that this Society, with but few exceptions, is composed of wealthy and thriving farmers, whose tables are daily groaning under every bounty the earth affords, but voluntarily returns, once a year, to so meagre a fare, from a traditional regard to their forefathers, who will say that there is nothing becoming or beautiful in the Anniversary of the Schwenkfelders? Doubtless, many of their number there are for whom the spirit of the memorial has departed, leaving but the empty custom drooping behind, as the sea-shell sighs over the exodus of its once occupant. But is not this the fate of every religious or national emblem too often? Still, we do not despise the institution itself on that account, nor hold responsible the innocent and sincere, for the abuse the unfaithful and frivolous are guilty of.

I have often, when looking at the "Landing of the Pilgrims," asked myself, why some one of our Pennsylvanian artists had not long ago taken the *Landing of the Schwenkfelders* under his pencil? Would not the monied and clan-proud families of Schwenkfelders gladly hang it to the wall? Such a Picture would, furthermore, help to perpetuate an historical event, which transpired within the career and limits of Pennsylvania, which ought not to be forgotten, and over which any one of the New England States would grow proud. Nor could it fail to render prominent the fact, that our Commonwealth had been originally designed by the beneficent William Penn, to prove a refuge for the oppressed, and that his design had more than once been reached in the case of individuals, such as Dr. Priest-

ly, of Northumberland, and Dr. Rauch, of Mercersburg, as well as with entire colonies of Friends, Mennonites and the Schwenkfelders. There are men of the easel, 'to the manor born,' who could thus happily adorn the history of the Keystone State. Where is Rothermel? Why might not he, let me modestly ask, employ his master-hand on such a scene, and thereby teach the people, in characters more striking than dead letters, that all the 'Pilgrims' did not land at Plymouth Rock? As there is much unwritten history, so is there many an unpainted scene of note and beauty too.

As this paper is intended as a contribution to the history of the Pennsylvania Germans, I venture to present a monograph of the unconscious father and founder of the Society, which quietly, yet tenaciously perpetuates his name, memory and teaching, within our Commonwealth—

Caspar Schwenkfeld.

This Silesian Knight was born in Ossig, A. D. 1490, and succeeded in rendering himself notorious, if not famous, in the Reformation-period already. Conscious of his noble descent, he early determined not to disgrace his family and rank through waywardness and folly, and accordingly devoted himself to the pursuit of Science. He attended the University at Cologne for several years, and spent some time at other seats of learning. He seems not to have reached any literary title or degree, however, as he speaks of himself as not being "a University-made Doctor or hireling Professor." He subsequently visited a number of German Courts, in order, as was the custom of his age, to equip himself as a valiant Knight. It was during his stay as a courtier with Charles, the Duke of Münsterberg and Brieg, that he became disabled, whether in consequence of a duel, or ill health, we are not told. He now turned his attention to Theology, for which department he had already evinced an *amateur* preference in earlier life. As the views of John Huss had enlisted a few earnest defenders near this Court, they speedily fructified in Schwenkfeld's mind, more especially now, since he decided to enter upon his newly chosen

calling. In obedience to an invitation extended him to become Counsellor to the Duke of Liegnitz, he left Münsterberg. Here, under the tuition of Counsellor Krautwald and the Pastors Werner and Eckel, he applied himself closely to the study of Greek, the Church Fathers and general Theology. He was, at the same time chosen, in accordance with his own wishes, as a Licentiate-Preacher in the St. John's Church at Liegnitz.

At this stage of his life, the news of Luther's separation from the Church of Rome spread abroad. The seeds of John Huss having already germinated in his soul, he was the more readily prepared to fall in with the Saxon Reformer, whose junior he had been by but seven years. He went forth accordingly, in his Protestant course, as an ardent admirer of Luther, and in 1524 addressed a Tract to the Bishop of Breslau, imploring him not to hinder the progress of the Reformation in Silesia. He subsequently remarked in reference to this period, that he had been "as strongly Lutheran as any one." Luther furthermore, congratulated Schwenkfeld on his pulpit efforts.

But their harmony was soon to be interrupted. The unwarranted licentiousness which he was obliged to witness in the so-called Evangelical party, soon prompted Schwenkfeld to advocate a more radical course. The masses having been relieved from the restraining duties, imposed through auricular confession, penance, fasting and kindred ordinances, which had proven so onerous to flesh and blood, they now fell into a gross abuse of their liberty. He wrote a Treatise on the subject, and dedicated it to the Duke of Liegnitz, which Luther is said to have greatly commended. But the disease, far from being remedied, only proved more threatening, in his eyes. His position, as well may be imagined, was not such as was likely to win the favor of the Protestant masses. Both the religious wings around him now already began to regard him with suspicion. Becoming more and more uneasy, he paid a visit to Luther in Wittenberg, in 1525. He spent several days in explaining his views, in reference to Morals, the Sacraments, and the Person of Christ, which were all more or less distinctive. Schwenkfeld relates, that Luther declared, during the interview

that he had himself been exercised on those points for some three years; that his views pleased him, in case the proof were adduced; that he had contended against them, however, with himself, and that he had still further objections to file. Dr. Bugenhagen, who had also been present, remarked: "We believe you to have good intentions, we think you honest, we know you to be a pious man." But the colloquy did not result in a satisfactory way. They parted, nevertheless, in peace and with the best of feelings.

Two months later, Luther wrote Schwenkfeld a letter, in which he admonishes him to cease seducing the minds of the people, lest the blood of their souls be required at his hands, and closed with the remark: "In one word, either you or we, must be in the bond-service of the devil, since we, on both sides, appeal to the Word of God!"

The morals of the populace still not mending, whilst Schwenkfeld continued to insist more and more strongly on external holiness, as a result of the indwelling Spirit, he now openly declared, that he could not approach the Lord's Supper, as long as the Doctors differed among themselves, as to its nature and efficacy, and the crowd participated therein with unwashed hands and hearts. He, at the same time, discarded infant Baptism and made several exceptions to the Lutheran Symbol. Thus the breach yawned more and more widely, whilst some of his former co-adjutors did not hesitate to pronounce him a heretic in good round terms.

He was not left without his adherents, however. His fine personal appearance, his affable manners, his telling eloquence and his undoubted piety, as well as his noble rank, all aided him vastly in drawing followers around his standard. But they were far from being as amiable and prudent as their Leader proved. They cried out loudly against the Sacraments, as held and defended by both Catholics and Protestants, in consequence of which King Ferdinand and the Duke of Liegnitz became displeased, and aiming a blow at the root of the evil, they agreed to banish Schwenkfeld from his manor and the territory, in 1529.

Though possessed of considerable estates, he readily relinquished all and adopting as his motto: *Nil triste, Christo recepto*, he journeyed through Germany, visiting various seats of Learning and Courts, disputing with leading Divines, and invariably winning the respect of the nobility, as well as the favor of the lower ranks. He is said to have ever exhibited the grace of charity in an eminent degree, and never to have lost his temper. He continued diligently to write on various Theological topics, as well, and swelled his productions to nearly one hundred Treatises and Volumes. His correspondence, besides, was of itself voluminous. At Tübingen an audience was afforded him, after which he gained permission to teach in public, though the licence had never been officially promulgated.

He endeavored during all this time, to effect a reconciliation with the leading Reformers. Even after his views were condemned at Schmalkald, in 1540, he was far from relaxing his efforts. In 1542 he sent a messenger of rank to Luther, with a Letter and Tract, in answer to which the famous malediction was issued by the burly Saxon, which is quite characteristic, and on that account, worth reading:

"My Dear Messenger and good Man:

Tell your Master, Caspar Schwenkfeld, as my answer, that I duly received his little Tract and Letter, at your hands, and that I hope to God he will desist from his course. He has already kindled a fire in Silesia, because of the Sacraments, which is not yet quenched, and which will continue to burn over his head forever. He nevertheless persists, besides, in his Eutychianism and Creaturism, and disturbs the Church, without having any mission or call from God. The poor simpleton! He is possessed of the devil, and does not comprehend or know his own babbling. But if he will not desist, I want him, at all events, not to bother me any further with his Writings, which Satan vomits and expresses from him without number. And do you deliver him my last word and opinion, to wit:—*May the Lord reprove Satan in you, since it is your own spirit, who has called you, and your own course, which you are pursuing, as*

well as all those who are running with you, Sacramentists and Eutychians, and your blasphemies to perdition, as it is written: Currebant etnon mitteban eos, loquebantur et nihil mandabam eis.

Given December 6, 1543.

MARTIN LUTHER, m. p. (with my own hand.)"

After this ugly missile, all fellowship between Luther and Caspar Schwenkfeld ceased. He had visited him on three different occasions, he tells us, and had repeatedly otherwise addressed him. He refused to retaliate, however, either by word, letter or act, but concealed Luther's answer among his private papers, until circumstances of later years compelled him to produce it in self-defence. He even prayed for Luther down to his dying day, and never hesitated to commend his virtues. Thus did he happily proclaim himself the natural and cultured Nobleman over his adversary.

In fine contrast to the above, stands Melanchthon's gentlemanly and Christian reply, written nearly two years earlier, and under like circumstances. It is well, certainly, to read this after *that:*

"*To my noble and dear Caspar Schwenkfeld von Ossig.*

MY KIND SIR AND FRIEND:—

The grace of God through Jesus Christ, first and foremost.—Your Book was promptly received, and would to God we could call the Name of our Mediator, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, with one voice and united hearts, since we are not Epicures, but fear and worship God.

I am surprised, however, that you should impose on me, as I am already sufficiently burdened, as you well know. I have my hands full in contending against the gross idolatries of the Papists. I will still examine your Treatise, as soon as I get the time, and forward you a brief and definite reply, leaving it then with other matters, to God. It strikes me as a labored effort. Many pious and intelligent minds know too, that I have taken no small pains to declare sound Doctrine. May God keep

you. May He grant both you and me a right mind and His Holy Spirit.

PHILIP MELANCHTHON.

Geneva, Wittenberg, Feb. 16th, 1542."

Who has ever been permitted to read a milder *Philippic?* The promised answer never came, though, for the reasons, that Schwenkfeld's position became more and more objectionable, and the labors of Melanchthon multiplied on his hands.

The Zuinglian Divines, likewise, took sides against him, of which he complains bitterly. Thus was Caspar Schwenkfeld isolated on all sides and in all directions. But his very loneliness only renders him the more conspicuous, and viewing him through the enchanting distance of three centuries, who can refrain from putting the question,—*Which of the reputed Reformers of the XVIth century sacrificed to the largest extent—the penniless, shaven Monks, who had nothing to lose, but rather a hope of gain, or Caspar Schwenkfeld, the castled and manored Knight of Silesia, who left all behind him, and presented the spectacle of a living commentary on his motto:* NIL TRISTE, CHRISTO RECEPTO?

He continued to wander from place to place in exile. His manor and native Silesia were offered him back at all times, on condition that he would promise to cease disturbing the Church with his views, and confusing the people. But he remained unmoved by the bribe, and died at Ulm, on the 10th day of December, in 1561, without regaining his estate, or seeing the land of his fore-fathers again. He attained to the 72d year of his life. His remains were buried "in a wine-cellar, under a corner-house, on Market Street, near the prison, and opposite the Mayor's Office."

"I believe," he exclaimed on his death-bed, "in One God, in Three Persons—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

"I believe the XII Articles of the Apostolic Creed."

"I believe all that is contained in the Old and New Testaments to be profitable to the elect."

"As to my office, calling and teaching," continued he, "I can say, that I never claimed to be an Apostle, or of Apostolic dignity. I am no University-made Doctor, or hireling Professor. But I have nevertheless had a sufficient calling and mission from our Lord Jesus Christ, of which the Holy Ghost bore good testimony and assurance to my conscience, for all that I may have been instrumental in accomplishing, namely:—to open the nearest road that leads to God, for such as sought my direction and counsel, independent of all by-ways and means—into the immediate presence of the only and full Mediator; as well as, to exhort and persuade them to lead a Christian and penitent life. To all this my writings ever point, established as they are on God's word."

He praised God for his glorious Grace awarded him during his eventful life, and especially now, during his departing moments. Suddenly he raised himself on his couch and exclaimed: "*Up! Aloft! Out of the devouring flames! Aloft, to Heaven!*" This voice he had heard, as he frequently declared, when he went into exile. He reclined and smiled—and smiling, died.

It is somewhat difficult to present a succinct, yet clear synopsis of Schwenkfeld's theory. In general terms, it may be said that Caspar Schwenkfeld had been the George Fox of Silesia, or, the veritable George Fox, perhaps, somewhat educated and sublimated. Consequently, it is no misnomer, to style his followers *the Pennsylvania German Quakers.*

In detail, the following four points may be noted as *characteristics:*

I. The Person of Christ, as he maintained, had not been sufficiently honored and exalted by the leading religious minds of his times. As Christ was "conceived" and "born," with reference to His human nature, and not "created," like the first Adam, it is not proper to speak of any part of Him, as *creature-like.* Hence Luther speaks against Schwenkfeld's "Creatureism." After Christ's ascension, likewise, His Humanity must be conceived of, not simply as glorified, but as *deified*, by becoming part and parcel, as it were of the blessed Trinity. In

this way, the "*Gloria*" of Christ, both on Earth and in Heaven, means something different, and vastly more for Schwenkfeld, than it is taken to signify in any current theological system.

II. The word of God, according to his mind, consists of the *written* and *spirit-word*. These are related to each other, not as shell and kernel, nor as channel and substance; but as shade and light, or as finger-board and city—the former addressing the senses of man exclusively, the latter, his soul. The written Word is, at best, only a complimentary overture to the physical man, whether regenerated or not.

III. The Sacraments, in his view, were likewise of such a dual order—the internal Baptism and Communion always going in advance of the outward ceremony, in order to effect a genuine Sacrament, whilst the water-baptism and the physical eating and drinking of bread and wine follow merely as exponential and professional acts. The former is indispensable; the latter is valuable, though its entire neglect, from the fear of its profanation, does not result in any disaster to the soul.

IV. The Ministry is not, he maintains, in any sense, a Mediating Order, or of a Priestly character; but a proclamatory institution—a Directory. He delights to speak of the Ministry as a "*Dienst*"—a Service, which has its own meaning again.

In one word, Caspar Schwenkfeld taught a plan of Salvation, *without the "means of Grace."* So far as these are found to enter into the arrangement at all, they are still regarded as but complimentary overtures to the senses. He reduced the Gospel economy to a naked Spiritualism, which neither the letter nor the Spirit of God's Word can be said to endorse. And allowing but for a moment, that man may presume to divorce what God has plainly joined together, it is hard to see, at what point such liberty must be said to stop. The amiable Melanchthon has therefore correctly characterized Schwenkfeld's theory, a sacrificing of God's Word for fanciful notions—a fanaticism. It is lamentable indeed, that a mind so earnest and well-disposed, should have fathered a system so visionary and erroneous. But as Caspar Schwenkfeld never forgot to distinguish between

his adversary and the errors of his adversary, we too may entertain no little respect for him, without sympathizing in the least with his well-intentioned, but still dangerous teachings. In zeal and sincerity he is not behind any of the recognized Reformers, whilst in sacrifice and self-denial, his cup may be said to have been larger, and more than full.

III. The Schwenkfelders.

The principality of Liegnitz, in Silesia, is written down as the cradle-place of this religious society. It was during Caspar Schwenkfeld's residence there, that he first raised his standard and quietly rallied his earliest adherents around it. Their origin dates from the year 1524. The most singular fact, connected with their history is, that this peculiar people maintained their separate existence some two hundred years, without having any organization, or enrolling themselves among the religious denominations. Prior to their emigration to Pennsylvania, they had been a party rather than a body. There were good reasons too, for such an unusually slow development. The established Churches of Silesia being Catholic and Lutheran, and no edict of toleration existing in favor of any other Creed, they continued to occupy a wholly negative position, for many years, in their native country, absenting themselves from the authorized congregations, abstaining from the Sacraments, and refusing to bring their children to Baptism. They were, in this way, delinquents, rather than transgressors. They assembled quietly in private houses and engaged in a simple worship, such as singing, praying and impromptu exhortation. Peaceably disposed and diligent in business, and desirous only to be 'let alone,' they were among the most desirable subjects of the Government, and for this reason, especially, were for a long time indulged.

But the patience of the authorities eventually run out, and a period of most galling persecution set in. In Liegnitz, Brieg and Jauer they remained in an oppressed state for a number of years. Their oldest Pastors, Werner and Eckel, were deposed already in 1541. They removed into the territory of Glatz,

consequently, drawing their converts largely along the Giant-Mountain. Their head-quarters were the villages lying at its base—Probsthayn, Harpersdorf, Laubgrund, Armenruh, Laugenaudorf, Lantusiefen, Zobten, Dentmansdorf and Hockenau. It has ever remained a peculiarity with this people, to settle in groups, and because they were thus found in clusters on either side of the mountain, it was said by their persecutors, that "Satan having determined to carry the Schwenkfelders to his own place, in saddle-bags, his beast fell headlong on the highest peak, and scattered them in squads on both sides of the ridge."

Down to 1590–1650 and 1725 they were collecting and locating in and near those localities. A mere remnant remained in Liegnitz, though the last member of the fraternity died there in the 74th year of his life, as late as 1826.

In 1719 the famous Jesuit Mission was instituted for their conversion. The Fathers, Regent and Milan, appeared among them and commenced with mild persuasions, which, proving of no effect, they exchanged for violent measures. Fully determined to be neither Catholic nor Lutheran, but to remain steadfast in their faith, and not daring to hope for any lasting period of rest, they fled, by night, to Lusatia and Gorlitz, in Saxony, in 1725. It was mainly through the persuasion of Count Zinzendorf that this exodus was brought about, who obtained for this self-exiled and poverty-stricken people the protection of the Senate of Gorlitz. The wily Count was not backward in endeavoring to draw this flock into his own fold. But the Schwenkfelders were not as readily moved. The Count too soon discerned their mind and ceased all efforts to proselyte.

Eight years after their removal to Saxony, their enemies effected an annulling of their liberty, by intrigue and misrepresentation, in consequence of which, the Schwenkfelders sought a permanent home in Pensylvania, in 1734. They left Bethelsdorf and Gorlitz, during the month of April, for Altona, in Denmark. Here three brothers—Abraham, Isaac and Jann von der Smissen—who were wealthy and generous merchants, paid the passage money for the entire colony to America. The Counties of Berks, Lehigh, Bucks and Montgomery were chosen

by them on their arrival, in certain localities of which they settled and beyond which they have never extended.

It was only after their settling in Pennsylvania, that they prepared to organize themselves into a religious denomination. No one being baptized, confirmed or ordained, of the entire Colony, and all on equal footing, they held an election, and chose a venerable Father of their number as their first Pastor. It was George Weis whom they elevated to the first Pastorate. In 1740 he had already finished his course on earth. In the year of his death, Frederick the Great proclaimed an edict of toleration and invited the Schwenkfelders back to Saxony and Silesia, he having "laid claim to certain principalities of the latter country, and supported his claim so powerfully by his arms, that Lower and the greater part of Upper Silesia, were ceded to him by the treaty of Breslau." Thomas H. Burrowes, in his "State-Book of Pennsylvania" remarks: "Three years after their departure, Frederick the Great of Prussia offered them strong inducements to return, having too late discovered the worth of those whom he had permitted to be driven into exile. But they preferred the freedom of their new home, and remained." It was only after they had earnestly considered the Emperor's proposition, however, that they concluded no more to return. They heartily thanked the Emperor, in a Memorial-Paper prepared in answer, to which they appended a history of their fearful trials and persecutions endured in their native land.

Balthasar Hoffman succeeded as the second Pastor, and served for twenty years, he having died in 1760. The period of greatest discouragement occurred immediately after Pastor Hoffman's demise. A cooling of their religious ardor set in, whilst the hardships and sacrifices of a wilderness-home affected the Society sorely. The thought of returning to Silesia, which they had forever dismissed in 1740, as they then declared, again became a matter of deliberation. But whilst they entertained the proposition with some degree of favor, an election for Hoffman's successor was held, and Christopher Shultz, Senior, was chosen Pastor. He immediately proved himself to be

the coming man—the man for the circumstances and the period—and became the actual founder and organizing spirit of the Schwenkfelder Society. He prepared them a Catechism from Caspar Schwenkfeld's Works, which is still their Symbolical Book, and corresponds to the Heidelberg Catechism of the Reformed Church in the United States, in reference to the classification of the Ten Commandments, and embodies the essentials of the Reformed Confession, if we except the doctrine of Infant Baptism. He likewise arranged a discipline, which, with some later amendments, is still in force, though adopted already in 1782. He continued the governing power and ruling spirit among the Fraternity, as well as respected and beloved among other denominations, down to his death, which occurred in 1789. The society now fully under way, an election was held and John Shultz, a relative of the venerable Pastor, was chosen to succeed him. He seemed to have obtained the mantle of his fore-runner, and presided with much efficiency over the entire community. By virtue of his pulpit eloquence, he officiated at many of the funerals occurring in Lutheran and Reformed families of the neighborhood, as well as in their Churches, whenever a vacancy occurred, through the death or removal of the stationed Pastor. In this way an intimacy grew up between the neighboring Churches and the Schwenkfelder Society. Their beloved Pastor died in 1830.

An election following, Christopher Shultz, Junior, of the same connection, became their minister and proved everywhere worthy of his predecessors. Tall, venerable, talented, self-educated and pious, he won their esteem and love as well as the good-will of the surrounding Church membership. Through him, more especially, had the intercourse and fellowship with the Reformed and Lutheran Congregations become intimate. At well-nigh every funeral occasion, the Schwenkfelder Pastor Shultz was invited to officiate at the house of mourning. So far, indeed had he gradually and quietly ingratiated himself into the love and esteem of the Reformed Congregations especially, that during a vacancy occurring in the history of one of the latter, through the Pastor's death, it was seriously proposed

to employ Pastor Shultz as a Supply, until a Pastor of their own should be elected.

The anomaly of an unbaptized and unordained Pastor officiating, from time to time, over a congregation which taught and practiced Baptism, Confirmation and Ordination, had indeed been seen and felt, but it continued nevertheless to be tolerated without any formal remonstrance. The silent murmuring on the part of the more orderly and Churchly-inclined laity, as well as the more positive complaints which the Pastors whispered into their members' ears, induced Pastor Shultz even to look into the manifest contradiction, as well as into the abnormity of his own position. He taught and believed a Catechism which inculcated an outward and inward Baptism, no less than an external and internal Communion, while, on the other hand, he saw himself standing aloof from both. The conscientious man became disturbed. He consulted with neighboring Pastors of the Churches, who advised him to bring Ordination and the Sacraments across the waters, at the hands of their forerunners in Silesia or Saxony. "So mote it be!"—said Pastor Shultz. But alas!—the few who had remained back were precisely in the same dilemma. Now commenced Pastor Shultz's violent inward conflict. There was no way open to bring an Apostolic succession over to the Schwenkfelder Society. The link could never be restored. His spirits fell and a midnight melancholy possessed his soul. He became an inmate of the Lunatic Asylum, and died under the cloud in 1841.

A number of Pastors were now elected by lot. At this time there were six—three in the Upper and three in the Lower District. They continued to hold their simple unsacramental services in private houses, according to the trans-atlantic custom of their forefathers. During the forenoon the Congregational Worship was attended to, whilst Catechetical Instructions were held in the afternoon. In 1789 the first Meeting-house was erected, from which six have multiplied. They number consequently six congregations, and perhaps three hundred adherents, together with their offspring.

They have at various times inquired after the history of their ancestors, hoping to discover some remnant of Schwenkfelders in Europe, or, at least, to learn more definitely the fate of their European brethren. In 1771-2; in 1818, and in 1857, a correspondence was entered into, to this end.

But not one remains to perpetuate the name, memory and Creed of Caspar Schwenkfeld beyond the seas. The last member of the fraternity, in Silesia, had been Melchior Dorn, who died in 1826. As soon as the act of toleration had been proclaimed, the aged were left to exhaust themselves, and the younger element assimilated with the ruling denominations around.

The last member in Gorlitz, had been a widow, with an infant of eighteen months. Her name was Anna Rosina Wagner. She was asked whether she felt inclined to become a member of the Evangelical Church, and replied that she would grant her child to choose for itself, but that she could not, as yet, become a Lutheran. This occurred on the 14th day of December, A. D. 1740.

The few Mission Chapels of the Jesuits, and the tombs of the long-ago deceased Schwenkfelders along the public roads and lanes, are the only memorials of their former existence in Silesia.

This brings us to speak of

THEIR PERSECUTIONS.

These commenced, it may be said, with Caspar Schwenkfeld's exile, and continued, with more or less severity, until their exodus to Pennsylvania, 1529—1734. We doubt whether any modern religious society can glory in a more cruel and cruelly-protracted history. Denying even the proper cause and end to have been at hand, which make the true martyr, none can deny that they possessed the martyr's spirit. Caspar Schwenkfeld had been offered his manor and country again and again, in case he would promise compliance with the practices of the Lutheran Church. But he steadfastly refused the enjoyment of his estates and civil liberty, at the price of conscience. The

Court Preacher Werner had been warned and threatened with deposition, provided he would not cease to proclaim his Schwenkfeldianism. The Duke of Liegnitz loved him much, but the order of his province more, and proving incorrigible, he was obliged to send Werner after his master into exile. He gladly left his post with its emoluments and departed. The host of nick-names, such as "Stenchfelders," "Fanatics," "Visionaries" and "Demoniacs," did not in the least move them, though not a few of their number belonged to the ranks of the nobility. Never so much as a retaliatory word could their adversaries press from them. They continued ever the same non-resistant, "quiet, obedient and diligent people." The Duke, Frederick II., issued severe decrees against all who should depart from the Augsburg Confession. None were permitted to harbor such openly, under pain of imprisonment and a fine of 500 *Gulden*. This statute had already been fixed in 1547. In 1550 he commanded all separatists to leave the territory, and the writings of Schwenkfeld, Werner and others to be delivered up to the authorities. He had the ears of a country-preacher pierced, a number of lashes applied to his bare back, and then exiled him forever.

The Magistrate in Löwensburg was equally severe. Pastor Hiller was accused of heresy and dragged before the Bishop of Breslau, and after being severely handled was let go on probation. Pastor Anton was sent to Vienna and laid in chains. Amid all their trials they still increased in number. During the interval between 1549–60, the Duke of Bavaria showed his cruelty in the region of Glatz. Not a few were brought in chains into the Churches, because they would not attend otherwise, from which they were again taken to their prison-cells, and left there to perish from hunger, or to be violently put to death. Their nearest relatives were not permitted to visit nor succor them. In 1580 the feudal lords joined hands with the clergy, to imprison all who inclined towards Schwenkfeld's practices, and after a formal and hasty trial, to send them to Vienna, as galley-slaves, or as soldiers against the Turks. They preferred Vienna, however, to Silesia, declaring "the

Catholic hearts to be still more tender than those of their Lutheran persecutors." In 1590 all mercy seems to have forsaken the tyrants. No friend of an arrested Schwenkfelder dare see to his farm-work, sow his seed or reap his harvest, in order that poverty and hunger might aid in their total extinction.

In Gröditzberg their sufferings were said to excel in cruelty those of all other quarters. When, therefore, the Castle of Wallenstein fell to the earth, in 1633, it was taken as a judgment of God. The sighs and groans of the unfortunate were left to be ended alone in death itself. Seldom did one escape from prison with life or health.

At the opening of the 'Thirty Years' War,' a period of rest set in for the Schwenkfelders, their persecutors having enough besides to engage their attention. They embraced this opportunity and attended diligently to their simple but peculiar practices, and inspired each other to remain faithful in absenting themselves and abstaining from the current religious ordinances.

But in 1648 their trials commenced with renewed fury. Catholics and Protestants now united in their efforts to render the society extinct. As neither could hope for their conversion, they both agreed in not permitting them to exist as an isolated people. Information was given to the civil authorities with diligence, and false accusations were reported besides, in order to move them in enacting a severe code against them. This was soon effected.

In 1654 religious burial was forbidden to all deceased Schwenkfelders. Their graves were dug secretly in gardens, and if the death was known, along lanes and by-ways. In 1680, imprisonment, starvation, the pillory and fines followed in rapid succession, together with exiling. The Emperor Charles VI., issued an Edict in 1718, in which he commanded all the followers of Caspar Schwenkfeld to be again exhorted and compelled to connect themselves with the Catholic, Lutheran, or Reformed Creeds—the only denominations tolerated in the realm. Their general good behaviour, however, pre-

vented the execution of the royal decree, for which indulgence they addressed a thanksgiving circular to his majesty. It was signed by a committee of six Schwenkfelder patriarchs.

But ere the year closed, or in the opening of 1719, the most vigorous measures were again enforced, which scattered the afflicted company into different secluded regions. By imperial authority, the Protestant Evangelists, Hensel and Neander, as well as the Jesuit Fathers, Regent and Milan, were sent among them to effect their conversion. Neander reported seventy conversions, which greatly offended the Jesuits and caused a bitter strife between the missionaries themselves, which was verily not calculated to win this people to either side. In 1720, another edict was sent forth, forbidding the missionaries to interfere with each other in their respec ive fields of operation. Soon the cloven foot became visible, when it was declared that "all the Schwenkfelders should be left over to the Jesuit Fathers." No Lutheran Pastor could henceforth interest himself in their conversion. A Christian burial service was rigidly denied them. The corpse was to be conveyed on a wheel-barrow or hand-cart, to the carrion pit or bone commons. For more than twenty years this barbarity was literally carried out, and hundreds of burials were consummated after this manner, down to the death of Charles the Sixth. The only exception made to the rule was in behalf of innocent children under twelve years, and this was so modified only after several years, and at the earnest solicitations of the more humane. Such then might be interred in consecrated ground, but the parents were compelled to pay double church-fees to the Catholic and Protestant clergymen.

Marriages were no longer consummated by this people, as they could only become valid at the hands of their persecutors. Betrothals were known to have existed for many years, without wedlock ensuing. These becoming known, imprisonment and fines were imposed on the guilty parties. As a sample, it is related, that four women were dragged in chains to Liegnitz, in 1722, during the depth of winter, and locked in cells, in which they were obliged to kneel on straw, with their hands in

stocks, for four days and nights. They survived their tortures only thirteen weeks.

Children were seized by night in their cradles, carried away and baptized, whilst a fine of *ninety dollars* was laid on the parents, together with an imprisonment of three weeks. The fines were paid and the imprisonment endured, *but the baptism was again secretly washed off.*

In 1725 another and still more galling edict was proclaimed, in consequence of which a considerable number of Schwenkfelders sold their effects at much sacrifice and fled to Gorlitz and Bethelsdorf, in 1726. Their flight occurred during the spring and by night. But their fate was not much improved by their removal, save that no direct cruelty was practiced against them for a time. Their persecutors, however, adroitly had them to be regarded with suspicion and, by means of insinuations and falsehood, spotted as disturbers of the peace, dangerous citizens and arbitrary characters. Then it was that they determined to seek a permanent home for themselves and their posterity in a better country, and bethought themselves of Pennsylvania. Soon all protection being withdrawn, they carried their resolution into effect. Prior to their departure, however, they first asked permission to organize their society and enjoy a toleration, alike with other religious bodies. The government was anxious likewise to retain them as laborers and subjects, too, but such liberty was still not promised them. They might have remained, provided they could have been content to live as Crypto-Schwenkfelders. Consequently about forty families departed for Pennsylvania in 1734, on the 29th day of July, thus filling up and at the same time overturning the cup of affliction. Those who remained in Gorlitz assimilated with the Evangelical churches, and were Schwenkfelders no longer.

THE PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN SCHWENKFELDERS

continue true to the faith, practices, and habits of their ancestors, as a society. It is not to be denied that the spirit and *animus* of their founder have been successfully perpetuated, by

this people, limited as their number is, for nearly a century and a half. They are even yet a quiet, unpretending, diligent and *peculiarly* pious order of Christians. They live in settlements as their fathers did, in the territory already indicated, and beyond which they have not extended. They are the bush ever burning, but yet not consumed. As they refuse to celebrate the sacraments, may they not prove a commentary to the words of Him who ever declared a divine philosophy—"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you?" Although their catechism delares positively in favor of the outward ceremony, as well as the inward grace, in the sacramental ordinance, they nevertheless follow in the steps of their fore-fathers, and refuse to celebrate both baptism and the Lord's Supper. They claim not to despise the holy mysteries, however; but to revere them. It is better to neglect, than to profane them, they maintain. They argue that their ancestry were pious and God-fearing, notwithstanding their neglecting the external rite. "Therefore we can be Christians even though we likewise abstain from the outward act." Again it is said by them: "Those who observe the ceremony are no more godly disposed, and many of their numbers even less, than were our fathers and we, their children are." *Cui bono*, then? And still further do they say: "Divines and their adherents are not agreed as to the meaning and efficacy of the sacraments. Baptism is whatever this or that man chooses to constitute it; the Lord's Supper is no more. Now then shall we draw down a judgment, not discerning the Lord's body?"

But the chief reason is, that there is no possibility for them to introduce the Sacramental ordinances in their Society, in any regular way. That day has gone by for the Schwenkfelder Society. There is not a single Pastor or member among them who has a Schwenkfeldian Baptism or Ordination. Consultation has been had and inquiry has been made many years, in reference to this point, but not the least satisfaction could be gained. One wing of this people is earnestly striving, after their introduction, even at this time, whilst another is fiercely opposing

all efforts in this direction. The former party is certainly in the right; but the latter is by all odds the shrewder and more consistent. This is the great question with the Schwenkfelders just now. "Let us have Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Ordination," cries one element. "How are we to get all this?" says another. "Let some clergyman of the Mennonite Society, of the Reformed or Lutheran Church, hand these rights over to us," cries the troubled party. "Then we are no longer followers of Caspar Schwenkfelder, but Menonites, Reformed or Lutheran," it is responded. This controversy has been had for many years, and will continue to harass the Society for years to come. As a Society, they will not merge with any other denomination, even though individual defections will continue to occur from year to year. The German Methodists have thinned out their ranks no little. The Reformed Church has drawn into her bosom not a few members and families. But there the old Schwenkfelder Society still stands and continues to perpetuate itself by its posterity coming up from year to year. It is extremely difficult to offer them legitimate counsel, by which they may still move on in the Schwenkfelder groove, and at the same time, enjoy all the elements of an orthodox Christianity. Perhaps some brave, bold man, may some day play the Alexander for them, and cut the Gordian knot by assuming to baptize and ordain a Brother, and then demand a similar favor in return. If such a spectacle would ensue, it would in no wise exceed the abnormity of the "Albright Succession" among the Evangelical Methodists. God alone can deliver the Schwenkfelders out of their dilemma. To mortal eyes but one regular way remains open for them—the way of oblivion, which numberless ancient sects have trod, and which modern sects are perhaps walking now. At all events, this thought is apt to float before one's mind, whenever the simple and lean worship of the Schwenkfelders is reflected upon. Indeed, I cannot help but wonder whether the same sad thought does not haunt them, whenever they engage in their hymns, and prayers, and impromptu addresses in the meeting house?

The process of initiation is very short and easy. You give your name, which is recorded, and all is over. This is generally done immediately after marriage, though it can be done before. After that, you are expected to attend worship—that is, sing, pray and listen.

Properly speaking, the Schwenkfelders oppose "mixed marriages." Still they are not absolutely forbidden, for the simple reason that the love of a young Schwenkfeldian heart will not always lie on a Procrustean bed. If you have transgressed this silent rubric, you must go and confess that you are sorry for having done that which you just before liked to do, and which you still are very well pleased with. After such a confession, and penance so light, many 'go and do likewise.'

Infant Baptism is repudiated on the ground, that the child is unconscious of the services, and not taught. But, nevertheless, as a Schwenkfelder peculiarity, it is well to note, that prayers are held over the new-born child, either at the house of its parents, or in the Meeting House. It has never been a question with them, whether an unconscious and untaught child can realize any more benefit from such a service than from Baptism itself? A mother, whose adult daughter entered the Reformed Church through Baptism, earnestly protested against performing the Sacrament over her, on the ground, that "prayers were had for their child in the Meeting House."

In memory of the charity displayed by the Vander Smissen Brothers to their emigrating forefathers, they founded a "Charity Fund" in the Society, which they piously guard, and endeavor to increase for the benefit of the poor. Some uninitiated minds have suggested, that the "loaves and the fishes" contribute much towards holding the membership together. The poor and disabled, it is said, draw a benefit, and in case of a dissolution, the last man takes all. It is bad to suspect and to impugn motives, however, and so let this surmise be considered a slander.

On a late occasion, having heard that the tombs of their ancestors, near Liegnitz and Gorlitz, were fast being desecrated, and the earth, with their very dust, carried away for road-

making purposes, their Pennsylvania posterity collected a handsome sum and forwarded it to the authorities, with a view of purchasing the grounds, and having them properly set apart and enclosed as the Burying Ground of the Silesian Schwenkfelders. It is not believed, however, that their moneys were appropriated to the laudable end which they had in view.

It is not to be denied that the Schwenkfelders are clannish and bigoted. A good measure of the Pharisee is embodied in a genuine Schwenkfelder. He is apt to discover it too. In the days of their pride, whenever the members of Churches attended their worship, it was not seldom remarked among themselves, that the "hawks mingled rather freely with the doves." We are the elect!—that expresses all.

In morals and socials, they are the *fac-similes* of their ancestors. The most punctilious even cannot bring a well-founded accusation against them. Modest, quiet, diligent and successful in their agricultural pursuits, they ever yet constitute an admirable element of citizenship. They are, besides, a well-to-do and wealthy class, in the main. A *poor* Schwenkfelder is a rarity. In this regard they are not as their fathers were. They secretly look upon their general wealth, too, as a Divine reward for their earlier steadfastness in the days of their persecution. Better, perhaps, to attribute it to their frequent intermarriages and economical habits.

Politically, they are all Republicans. Non-resistant, they still supplied the Government with their ballots and purses, whilst not a few shouldered the musket. When reproached for thus acting against their principles, their answer was, that 'they were only non-resistants against the lawfully constituted Government—the powers that were ordained of God.'

In looking over the nomenclature of Casper Schwenkfeld's Colony to Pennsylvania, one cannot but be struck with the perpetuation of their *names* down to this day. As there had been in 1734, so there still are the Shultzes, Grebles, Krauses, Maeschters, Yeakles, Haebners and Anders, with but few, yea, very few additions.

The older Families of Schwenkfelders were more than ordinarily intelligent. You can find not a few Latin volumes exposed for sale, with which their deceased fathers were familiar. And stranger than all else, you may see dozens of huge folio volumes, in manuscript, done by the women, in order to possess Caspar Schwenkfeld's works. These are as neatly written as many compositors execute their tasks.

Music and Mechanics received a large share of attention, too. But the younger element is fast becoming less and less distinguished in the favorite departments of their forerunners. In a word, the Schwenkfelder Society is in that state which may be called "the beginning of the end."

Art. III.—UNION WITH THE CHURCH.

UNION WITH THE CHURCH, the solemn duty and the blessed privilege of all who would be saved. By Rev. H. HARBAUGH, D.D., author of the "Sainted Dead," &c. "He that hath not the Church for his mother, hath not God for his Father." Fourth edition revised. Phila: S. R. Fisher & Co., No. 54 North Sixth St. pp. 127.

"WHERE IS THE CITY?" Second edition. Boston: Roberts Brothers 1868, pp. 349.

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE.

DR. HARBAUGH, the sainted author of the first volume, was born in Pennsylvania, and reared in the bosom of the German Reformed Church, and was a true and faithful representative of the educational system of Christianity, prevailing in that branch of the Church of Christ. The second volume is thrown out on the world without having a name on the title page that is responsible for its contents, but whoever the author is, he is responsible for the system of Christianity which it advocates.

and which has done vast mischief to the cause of true, evangelical religion.

The authors of these volumes, represent two tendencies in religion; these are wholly diverse, and may be regarded as types of different systems of thought, as well as of Christianity. The first one is a practical treatise on Union with the Church, and moves in the sphere of Christianity, as apprehended in former ages, and now, to a great extent, in the German Reformed Church, and makes earnest of the Church of Christ, as a real order of grace, into the bosom of which, souls are to be born—reared—nourished and prepared for heaven. The second moves in an order of thought altogether different, which sees nothing special in the Church—nothing in her heaven-ordained means, but seems to regard the Church only as a place of safe keeping for the soul, after the work of conversion—the New Birth has taken place, there to be kept safe, until God calls it into another world. The one regards the Church as the "mother of us all;" the other as a place where nothing is to be had for spiritual support, in the way of growth, but only a place of safety. This may be seen from the following: "It would be a difficult and almost endless task, to exhibit all the good effects which will result to you from a right connection with the Church. They are as extensive and various as the influences of religion itself, which it is the great aim and end of the Church to beget and unfold in the heart and life of all. Many of its influences are so silent that they cannot be traced in their details. Gently as the dew so its cheering, refreshing and life-giving influences distil on the heart; and it is because these influences are so gentle and silent, that they are so difficult fully to appreciate." Hosea xiv. 5, 6, 7. *Union with the Church*, pp. 110, 111. Now turn to the other volume, and there you have another theory, as the following shows: "Israel Knight opened his Bible at Ez. xlviii. 35, reading, 'And the name of the city from that day shall be, *The Lord is there.*" Closing the book, he reflected. At length he said, 'O! that I might find the city with that name.' Israel Knight had come to this recognition. . . . . *Somewhere, there is a Church, a peculiar people*

whose name is rightly, 'The Lord is there.' Being a youth who lacked little of his majority, he addressed to his guardian the following:

Respected Sir:—I hope I am a Christian. As I have had but little experience, and have examined but few books except those used in my classes, I am undecided what Church I had better select, with which to connect myself. Please advise me upon this important subject, and oblige, Yours obediently,

ISRAEL KNIGHT.

He received this reply: My dear young friend: I hope you are a true disciple of Christ. He that doeth His will will know of the doctrine. Love the Lord your God with all your heart, and your neighbor as yourself, and you will find the truth. An old man like myself sees through different spectacles from those used by young eyes. God is good. He gives wisdom to all who seek it with a humble mind. Therefore, look for yourself; but my advice is—*look on all sides before you cleave to any.* Be cautious about starting to make your jar, lest, like the one you found in Horace, as the wheel goes round, it turns out an insignificant pitcher. Yours Truly, *Ephraim Stearns.*" *Where is the City?* pp. 7, 8.

Now, here is a soul, a Christian, all right in its own estimation, hunting the Church, and is encouraged, not to cleave to any one, until he has seen on all sides, that is to say, that soul found all in the sphere of nature that it needed, and on that plane is to fight the battle of life in the world, and in some way, neither he nor his guardian could tell, is to make his way to heaven. Here are two distinct schemes —distinct theories of the Church—of our Christian life set forth, which affect the life and condition, everything of importance which has a bearing on this and on the future life. This last scheme is modern, and it has, to a great extent, supplanted the faith of early Christianity, which faith, is found, partially, in a few branches of the Church of the Reformation, the larger portion of our Protestantism has succumbed and is moulded by this scheme, and has very little in common with the maxim, imprinted on the title

page of the little volume by Dr. Harbaugh, while this ancient faith recognized the Church as a divine order of grace—a real institute from heaven to men, for the salvation of souls. The theory of Christianity—of the Church, which we find in the volume, "*Where is the City?*" is the one prevailing generally in New England, radiating from thence into all parts where New England influence and theology extend, moulding the Christian life—conditioning society and even reaching over to the State. The *Bibliotheca Sacra* stands in the same stream, for in the notice it gave of this strange book, there was no intimation of dissent, and its theory and position were accepted as seemingly right, sound, and proper. As German Reformed, trained in the system of religion represented by Dr. Harbaugh, a book with tendencies like that "*Where is the City?*" cannot be safely recommended as suitable reading, especially for the young baptized members of the Church of Christ. There is no doubt but that the tendency and influence of the book are of the low, humanitarian order, which have been and ever will be, pernicious to true vital piety, and the less paper and ink are wasted in the production of such books, the better for society and the Church: whereas, a book like that of Dr. Harbaugh, will live and go on its mission for good, pointing the reader to Christian responsibilities and duties, and directing him to the way which leads to a spiritual home, where food for the soul is found, where it may grow in grace—where it may live and prepare for a better life.

Israel Knight, in his opinion, became a Christian, he does not tell how. He believed himself a sincere Christian, out of the Church, independent of any means of grace ordained in the Church. He says nothing of an external submission to any initiatory rite, nothing of spiritual food, other than is enjoyed by every body in the world. And this being so, we wonder not that he is cast about from one sect to another, in his Quixotic hunt, after, what he supposed, the Church. The Apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost, taught a different lesson. "Repent and *be baptized* every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy

Ghost." Acts ii. 38. A Christian, and then hunt the Church! Such a theory, however wide-spread, does violence to the conception of the Church—the Body of Christ, as delineated by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Ephesians. Turn now to the little volume of Dr. Harbaugh, here, in its pages, so simple, practical, you are brought into another world. According to Dr. Harbaugh the Church exists,—an order of grace from heaven, having forces and powers to open the eyes—subduing the heart, and is an object of faith, which the baptized child in the Christian family is taught, from infancy on, to repeat and to assert, when repeating the Articles of our undoubted Christian faith, "*I believe* in the Holy Ghost,—*the Holy Catholic Church*—the Communion of Saints." More than this, the divine call is made and comes to the baptized child, that it is a blessed privilege and a solemn duty to submit to this divine order, by a renunciation of the world and the flesh, and a public profession of faith, ratifying baptismal engagements, and becoming a member of the Church, permitted to share in all her blessed means, and so, also, to become a faithful disciple of the crucified Lord. Any one can see that here are two theories—two schemes—two systems—the one rising above the order of things, apprehending unseen realities; the other is in nature, and moves on that low plane, and makes little account, whether any one belongs to the Church, only so that he is a Christian, a sincere disciple of Christ. To state the case, reveals the barefaced contradiction in which the system is involved.

Different theories of religion.

Israel Knight was a Christian, as he believed, but not a member of any Church. He does not tell us that he ever submitted to baptism, which would have been the first lesson in the School of St. Peter. Dr. Harbaugh tells us, that *it is necessary*. "It is necessary to be united with the Church, because, according to the Scriptures, *we are united to Christ through the Church*. . . Christ is the HEAD. The Church is the BODY. Christians are the *Members* of that body." Eph. i. 22, 23; p. 87. These theories prevail to this day. Each one

has its influence, and there can be no dispute, that, to this theory of being a Christian outside of the Church of Christ, without church-membership, is to be charged very much of the disordered state in which the Christian Church is now found. For if you can have on the plane of nature, all you need to prepare for heaven, why have the Church, and be faithful in the use of her blessed, heaven-ordained means? Israel Knight, the representative of a very large class, seems to have an idea that religion is a matter which holds between himself and his God alone, that it is an individual transaction, which he commences, carries on and completes, as an individual would make a contract with his fellow-man. He has no idea of the necessity of an order of Grace, in the use of the means it affords, where this only can be done. No idea of a Communion of Saints, and that he becomes complete, in common with all believers, as the Apostle declares in his Epistle to the Ephesians. This is seen from the way he starts out to hunt the Church. He is a Christian, and with this impression he starts out in his search, and a weary, long hunt he has of it, turning out in the end, that his effort was fruitless, that he found, "*The Lord is there*," inscribed nowhere, but. . . Israel said, "There is peril in my thus halting between opinions. Henceforth I will seek to be a disciple of Christ. I shall love all men though they love me not. In whatever place I find a true worker for the good of his fellow-man, I will be to him a brother. And with this simple, yet sublime faith in his heart, he went forth again into the world, no longer seeking the city. He had found it, and over all the gates on either side, he read this inscription: *Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest*," pp. 348, 349. And was this the city Israel Knight found, and after all what is it? Where does it differ from the ancient heathen? Wherein is it better than that of Seneca and hundreds of others? No, that is not the city to which the Apostle points; it is not the Kingdom of God, that was at hand in the Person of Jesus Christ. Who could recommend such reading to the young or to any one? We have had too much of this same kind of milk and water trash, from which we are suffering, and such

books, with such humanitarian tendencies deserve the severest condemnation.

1. *Emotional religion.* In this form of religion we have that system, which, by human contrivances exciting the feeling, attempts to bring the soul into a right relation to God, independent of the means which are in the Church, for those purposes. It makes no account of former relations. It takes hold of the soul, converts it and fits it for heaven, without baptism, the Lord's Supper, or the regular Ordained Means of Grace. There have been persons living in this system, who were converted, or in other words were, like Israel Knight, Christians, who, however, had found the Church, though they never had been baptized, yet were regular members of the Church! What a commentary on the sermon of St. Peter, "Repent, and *be baptized, &c.*" This theory has it, "You must be converted, that sufficeth." Have we not had enough of that scheme? Has not the Body of Christ suffered enough? Is it any wonder, that things are disjointed, and that this same spirit will cry out against the old educational theory of religion that it is stagnant, popish-puseyism? But it may be said in reply, "Pull out the beam that is in thy eye, then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye."

Israel Knight, started out in his weary hunt with this theory. In some way he became a Christian, but no member of the Church, the Body of Christ, and in his search for the City, he first turns up among the Baptists. Here he hunts about (after all he was not so easily satisfied), yet on the whole, he was pleased with their practice, the rationalistic interpretation they gave of the ordinance of Baptism, and his mind was biased in that way, and he became strongly inclined towards the Baptists. However, he held off, desiring further light, and this he sought from a certain Baptist, Doctor Elias, whom he heard preach on the subject of close communion, and with whom he met the next morning. In the conversation which took place, in the eager search after light, Israel proved that he desired more than the Dr. was able to give, and the Dr. was relieved from his close quarter, into which he had been driven when the

sound of the whistle of the engine announced the arrival of the train and the Dr. left and Israel remained unsatisfied. Accordingly, Israel did not cast in his lot with the followers of Dr. Elias, and the next we hear of him, we find him among the Congregationalists. Here he was diligent in learning and inquiring after the city he was in search of, but with all his efforts, the same result is reached as before. There was no city there. There are some points worthy of note in his experience among the Congregationalists. He comes into a Congregational Sunday-School, the teacher was an elderly clergyman, the subject of the lesson was baptism. Israel in some way entered into a discussion, by stating difficulties to the theory of Congregational Baptism, the teacher replied, "I hold 'Christian Baptism' to be an unimportant term, since Christ was baptized, not to found a rite, but to observe one long established." Among the Baptists, the subject was, of course, the mode of Baptism, that harp of a thousand strings, which, when among the Congregationalists, was riddled so completely by his teacher and the preachers, that Israel's mind had to give way on that subject, and on the historical part of that subject, the evidence is clear and convincing against the Immersionists. With all this evidence against the Baptists, he did not find here what he was after, and the Congregational Church lost so noble a prize as Israel would have been had he fallen in there. Still he was in his opinion, a Christian without a spiritual home. The next we find of him, he turns up among the Methodists, and he soon forgets his Baptistic predilections and his Congregational education, and Israel is in the system which converts persons by the score and by the hundred. As a specimen of his training in this denomination, we have the following scene, a specimen seen in other denominations, by nearly every pastor of the German Reformed Church, where this system, into which Israel is now brought, is in vogue. As they (Israel and his companion) entered the outer hall and pausing there until a favorable time to enter, some one within broke out into singing, "I'm glad *Salvation's free*, *Salvation's free* for you and me." Here, in doctrine Israel found a difference from that of Calvinism among the Con-

gregationalists. Israel listened to the many voices in this singing, and saw the expression of the faces of some of the foremost who sat in conspicuous seats, which seemed fully committed to the manner and time of the work, and he thought, "This is what is meant by singing lustily." As the song went on, some one broke out with the exclamation, "Praise God."

A person at the desk, who seemed to be the leader of the meeting, now arose, and standing still a moment, looked around in a wild and intense way upon the audience, then said a few words expressive of his hope that they should have a good meeting that night—such a meeting as they never had enjoyed before in their lives. Souls were to be converted by scores, if they only had faith, and were willing to come up to the work of the Lord; but if the drowsy, stupid church-members were going to hold back, as they so often did, just like great leaden cogs on the wheels of the car of Salvation, they might as well give it up, first as last; and bid farewell to the miserable wretches in that audience who were now swiftly on their way to the pit of damnation. He concluded by calling on every soul in that congregation . . . to come forward on the front seats around the stand, and consecrate themselves anew to the Lord.

For a moment there was a breathless silence, then each began to look at his neighbor, to see who was going to move and who was not.

"Clear the seats!" now cried the leader, waving his arms on either hand; "clear the track for the progress of the Car of Salvation! We are going to have a mighty time to-night, a glorious warming up here. Now while we sing, all who love our Lord Jesus, and are willing to stir themselves for Him, come around here." (This surely was the *thunder and the earthquake.*)

He then began to sing, while a movement commenced throughout the house.

When the vacated seats were all filled, and others stood near who seemed to belong to that company, the leader said, "Now, sister Atkins, we will join with you in prayer. We want every

one here in these seats to give himself or herself up anew to the Master. Right here, and just now, expect a blessing. Every one kneel, every one pray now, while the sister calls upon the Lord to fit us up for a glorious work here to-night. Let every soul in this house, Saint or Sinner, get down on their knees." (Israel not thinking himself included, did not kneel).

No sooner had the sister began to pray, than voices from every direction broke out with loud ejaculations, so that it was difficult to catch only broken sentences of her petition. These were accompanied by other loud noises made by their hands. The strong cries of "Just now, Lord." "O come right here, Jesus." "Yes, yes, that's what we want." "Amen." "Come Lord, come right down now and work like Thyself," "Amen," "Hallelujah," "Glory," "Glory to God!" bore down the minor key of the woman's voice, so that it seemed it would have been equally well if she had but commenced praying, and ended when these cries ceased. . . .

The singing concluded, the leader said, "Now all who have got a blessing and are willing to work for the Master to-night, rise up and show your colors for the Lord." (This was taking the vote on religion, as is done even now in some churches; of course, few would vote contrary.) Most of the persons arose, of course, and those that remained had a withering rebuke administered to them, as follows: "You are all like wood-chucks in your holes. Nothing will ever bark you out but the dog of persecution." The seats were cleared again and the scene repeated. And this was worshiping the Infinite Jehovah!! Alas! for the Church with such contrivances.

By and by Israel found himself drawn into this system. "These people are in earnest for the Salvation of my soul," he said to himself; "although I have believed I was a Christian before, I feel now that I am not like these. Perhaps I have been deceived."

Israel sums up the result of this exercise as follows: "I came hither," said Israel, "without knowing for what intent the Lord led me. I came with gainsaying, and it seemed to me that your words and ways were strangely erroneous. I confess

that I had no part nor lot with you. But God has moved me to feel very differently. . . . I think of a truth that the Spirit of the Lord is here," he continued. "Amen!" "Glory to God," cried voices on all sides, while the tears fell from many eyes. . . . "For a long time I have sought for the people whose God was truly the Lord, for the Church from among the varied Churches of the land, of which it might well be said, as the city described in Ezekiel, whose name is '*The Lord is there*.' I believe that I now have glimpses of this holy place with the holiest of names. My soul is filled with rejoicing that it sees, though in the dim distance, the spire and turrets of its home, its Christian home!"

It commenced well but ended otherwise for Israel; and now examining into this system, its doctrine and order, he was disappointed, and though different from his former state, he did not find the city "The Lord is there," among the Methodists.

Next we find him among the Episcopalians. These, it seems, made not much impression on his mind. How could they, emerging from the earthquake and thunder into an altogether different order of worship? Then we find him among the Quakers, next he makes the round with the Swedenborgians, and then the Universalists, the Spiritualists, the Unitarians. Now this is a complete round, and no one would accuse Israel Knight of a want of perseverance and determination to find the object of his earnest and diligent search. The conclusion of his wanderings we gave before.

This experience of Israel Knight is that of a great part of our professed Christianity. It starts out in the same way. It expects, out of the ordinary ways of God, blessings nowhere promised. It ignores grace wherewith to reach the end proposed; it ignores the Church, as the very order, in which, by supernatural grace, the end, after which the soul longed, can possibly be reached. This scheme, into which this man was led, and which wrought on him, lies in the open plane of nature. It works by rational laws, and fails to apprehend any mystery in this unseen world, full of powerful and living realities to

the earnest and believing soul. For Israel Knight the Church was not indispensably necessary.

Taking this view of the case, the book before us advocates no necessity of church-membership, and on this score falls in with the large class of books, which are neither positive nor negative, but milk and water, and are not the books to be placed into the hands of the baptized members of the Church, and it may be regarded as standing in full sympathy with that wide-spread theory, that you can be converted out of the Church, live without her, and die peacefully without her, and then go to heaven. To any one who desires to see at a glance what a falling away there has been since the days of Augustine, Cyprian and other fathers, on this very subject, his curiosity can be gratified. But to read it, in order to obtain light in reference to personal individual duty, there will be disappointment.

2. *Educational.*—In opposition to the far, wide-spread theory noticed above, one in which the greater part of our common Protestantism is involved, and which threatens seriously, we find a different theory, one coming down in the long line of the ages, hoary with age, which comes out, or rather forms the ground upon which Dr. Harbaugh's little book is based, and which leads us into another world of thought and religious life. Here is no thunder nor earthquake. It proceeds in the belief of an order of grace at hand, in which our disordered life is to be restored, and so we enter into this higher order, where the Soul is to be prepared for meeting Christian duty in this life, and finally enter into heaven. To do this, there must be the implantation of a divine seed,—the introduction of the subject into a higher order of life, and this seed is to be nurtured and nursed in order to bring forth fruit. Here the subject is met at the very beginning of life, and by baptism is grafted into another order—grafted into Christ, in union with whom his Christian life is to unfold itself. Implanted thus into the Body of Christ, the Church, the means of grace are afforded, in the use of which, the Soul is to grow in grace, and accomplish the great work of Salvation. In this view, the sub-

ject becomes a Christian as he enters the Church, where in due time he becomes fully enlisted in the cause of Christ. . . . .—"The act of God, as it is made to touch them in the Holy Sacrament of Baptism itself. The ground, the fundamental substratum, for all Educational Christianity is thus purely *objective*. Without this to begin with, there is no room to talk of any inward and subjective evolution of the Soul, educationally, to a true Christian life. Without this, it must ever be presumptuous unbelief for parents so much as to think of forming the natural life of their children to a regenerated heavenly and spiritual life. They must have more than any promise of nature for that; nothing less than the assurance of an actually present Divine (more than merely natural) *potentiality*, already joined with the case, can justify them in proposing to bring up their children with such high aim as this. . . . Such assurance requires faith; and faith here, to be real (not notion only, or fancy), must have its proper supernatural *object*, certified and made sure to it as by the Seal of God Himself. This is just what is done in holy baptism."—*Reformed Church Messenger, Jan.* 12, *Art., Baptismal Grace.*

In this little book we have a full and distinct affirmation of the Article in the Creed, "*I believe in the Holy Catholic Church*," and then, in this faith, it practically forces home the solemn duty, upon every one to become a member, by a public profession of faith in Christ, into union with whom the subject was brought by his baptism. In the first part of the book Dr. H., takes up objections which many now-a-days urge against joining the Church and make them the ostensible reason why they remain out of the Church and thus away from Christ. In the second part, there are forcible, practical arguments assigned, why every one should join the Church and be a living, faithful member in her communion. The influence of this little volume cannot be otherwise than wholesome, and it offers safe food to be placed into the hands, especially, of the young, to be taken up, earnestly read and studied.

These theories of Christianity and of the practical duties of religion lead us next to

Different theories of the Church.

This follows, as effect follows cause, and this fact stands out clearly in these books before us. These theories find their ground in the conception which the subject entertains of Christianity, and are now in conflict with each other. The one is regarded as purely and genuinely Protestant, the other is regarded, by the earnest guardians of genuine Protestantism, as old, antiquated, semi-popish, squinting strongly towards Rome. Of this fact, the German Reformed Church affords a living example, and it is the glory of this venerable branch of the Church of the Reformation, that she did not allow these untoward waves fully to roll over her. Sooner would we see her go down, with this ancient standard flying, than to see her succumb and become traitor to reformed Protestantism.

The tract of Dr. H. regards the Church as a Divine institution, for the purposes of Salvation—an order instituted by Jesus Christ, in the bosom of which the healing of the nations is to be accomplished—an institution having means and forces to do all that is proposed. Here is the home of the Christian—in her he is born—in her nurtured, and here grows to be prepared, by her blessed means, for heaven. Here is a door of entrance; entering her are found means to carry forward the great work of preparation, and in her the baptized soul realizes the fact only, "that in life and in death, in soul and in body, I am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ." It falls in with the ancient Creeds—with the ancient faith, *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, and also, the significant words on the title page. The other theory is wholly different. It regards the Church as a place of safe keeping, not as a nurturing, nursing mother. In her you find no more than you do in the world. Your soul is converted—you have wonderful experiences—you have every thing you need, and you reach heaven at last, just as well out of the Church as in her. This was the experience of Israel Knight. He was, in his opinion, a Christian, and then started on the weary search after the Church, a place of safe keeping. You hear nothing of the act

of baptism, as an initiatory rite into the mystical body of Christ—nothing of the Holy Supper as Divine food to nourish this implanted life. What if it be popish, will you give it up? All that is in the order of nature, and the Church, as confessed in the Creeds and as held in ancient times, to him, and to our modern wisdom, becomes an unmeaning appendage, thrust in, to hinder, to fetter and to keep down the soul earnestly desiring freedom. This theory, alas! is only too common; and it has, to a great extent, supplanted the old order, and now threatens, so seriously, the whole interest of Christianity. And yet there is but one order—but one faith, which must be held by every one desirous of being saved. If the Church is really the Body of Christ—if she is a divine institution for the healing of our disordered spirits—if she is the mother where spiritual life is to be had, it is clear, that union with Christ is only through the Church, and, therefore, union with the Church is not only a privilege, but a solemn duty.

Difficulties in the Way.

To resolve these, we are met by one at the outstart. Our present Protestantism is not outwardly one—it is a distracted, divided interest. It is often remarked, we know, that the differences we find are all right, and open the way for every one to find a home; that no excuse can be made by any one for not joining the Church, for the simple reason, that in this endless variety every shade of opinion can be accommodated. For instance, if one is desirous of entering the Church by Immersion, here is the open way—if it is to be by dipping three times forward or three times backward, or only once, there are persons who point out the way. Any sort of fancy can be accommodated. If it is necessary to pass through such scenes as described by Israel Knight in the Methodist prayer meeting, the necessity may be satisfied. If any other way, equally inconsistent with true religion, it can have it. It is surely convenient, every one will admit this; but it gives us a sad picture of the Body of Christ. Say what we will, it is a sad position for the Church of Christ to be in, far different from that for

which the Saviour prayed, *that they all may be one*, or that of the Apostle in his Epistle to the Ephesians—and it is the duty of the Christian to see and acknowledge this, and to labor and pray that it may speedily be brought to an end. And yet, admitting this sad fact, *there is a Church*, and though you may be unable to resolve the difficulty, it absolves no one from the duty of professing his faith and uniting fully with the Church.

This distracted phase of the Protestant Church was a serious obstacle to Israel Knight, in not joining the Church. It is true, his theories of religion and of the Church were wholly defective, yet he seemed to feel that he needed something he really had not, and hence his search, as well as the endless confusion in which he found himself. Dr. H. takes hold of the difficulty—frankly admits it still insists that the Church exists, and that, therefore, there is no excuse. "We freely confess that the Church is divided into many parts, and we mourn over it. It is a great evil, and those who are the means of dividing it are certainly very guilty before God. Christ instituted only one Church, and it is His will that there should be but one fold, as there is also but one Shepherd—One Body, as there is but One Head. . . . Grant, then, that the Church is divided, and that this is a great evil, it does not destroy it," (p. 11). Early in the history of the Church we find diversity of opinion; but for sixteen centuries, with her divine force and power, she suppressed heresies—fixed definitely the Christian faith, enshrined in the venerable Creeds, and majestically moved forward as the Body of Christ.

In connection with the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, there was the assertion of another principle, viz: That of the Bible, the only rule of faith, interpreted by private judgment.*

* In what is here said of the principle of private judgment and the spirit of sect and schism, reference is had to a spurious element that came in with the Reformation, which Protestantism must seek to eliminate. The Reformation in its true inner spirit did not set aside the Church and her holy sacraments, but in the original Protestant confessions maintained firm faith in "the holy Catholic Church," as set forth in the Creed. The higher stadium of Christianity, which the Church reached in the Reformation, was attended with new and greater dangers; but these will finally have to give way. Protestantism should labor to overcome the evil.

This theory was taken up by many, and so skillfully handled that before the Reformers fell asleep, the Bible, by this violence, became for every one what his own fancy and judgment made it, and, by the same principle still, we have the same effect; and it is painful to confess, that this very principle is steadily at the work of disintegration and seriously threatens to swamp the whole interest of Protestantism. It may seem pleasant, and it may be convenient to say, that all shades of belief can be accommodated, but the accommodation is in the Church and not in the subject, and far different from the Athanasian Creed, "Whosoever will be saved, before all things, it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith, which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." If it is a fact that the Church must accommodate herself to the individual, she finally becomes a creature of the brain made and unmade to suit whims and prejudices, and is dragged to the level of nature, and becomes no better than the Order of Red Men, Odd-Fellowship or Free Masonry. From this theory, Good Lord, deliver us! This fact stood in the way of Israel Knight. The result is not "that they all may be one." The case must be regulated in some way—we must have Unity, and it becomes a question after all, whether the Bible is not safer in the Church, in the hands of the person properly authorized to unlock the gate to divine truth, and to discharge the holy functions of the ministry, than in the hands of every Tom, Dick and Harry, who will read it according to his own prejudices, and at times, foolish notions; and whether it is pleasant or not, this very question may be kept in the back-ground; but, sooner or later, it will come forward for settlement, no doubt, as a cure to the evils which afflict our Protestantism. There must be an umpire somewhere, to which the appeal may be made, that it may be known which is right and which is heresy. One of the great dangers to which our age is exposed is this spirit of free-thinking, this principle of subjecting the Word of God to the crucible of unenlightened reason, and attempting to make it square with it. Witness the demonstrations

of parties in Florence, Milan, &c., on the opening of the Œcumenical Council, " . . . banners were in the procession of the most radical order;" one had inscribed, "*Science the only religion in future.*" If this is what the down-trodden, oppressed Italian would give us, struggling for Liberty, as we are told, we are free to say that we share with him not one spark of sympathy. Any one can see what the result in that case would be.

The Church is one, as there is but one body, and this fact was maintained for sixteen centuries,—troublers were silenced, and branded as heretics, and some of the reformers felt the force of this indisputable fact, and there was manifested a spirit of compromise, which, however, could not succeed, and presently the Reformation divided into two confessions, coming down to our days. Not only this, but these divided and subdivided, running into endless divisions, and not the most exact rules of calculus can calculate how small the fragments may become, or where the divisions will end; and what is worse than all, these now live on each other—prey on each other—attempt to devour each other, as the lean and fat kine, so that it is true and cannot be gainsaid, Protestantism, with its divided interests, engages not in fighting the world and the devil, but fighting itself. This surely is a blot which the warmest friends of the system can neither justify nor defend, and it is equally true that this very fact stands in the way of many, as an opposing barrier, and keeps many (inexcusably) from a duty which they solemnly owe to God and to their own souls; namely, a consecration to the service of God, in soul and body. How long this unfortunate condition will continue, no human eye can see. It must ever lie heavy on the Christian heart longing for unity. In this confusion, where sects multiply so rapidly, we have always a want of unity. The Church, however, cannot be divided as our modern Protestantism presents the case. The faith of the Church cannot be so uncertain, nor unwavering as it is presented; if it be so, it becomes of all things most uncertain.

In our whole divided interest, we have professors calling

themselves Christians, but are not such in spirit. They bear the same name, but have not the same spirit, and this is another serious objection which stands in the way of many outside of the Church. While all profess themselves Christians, they have discordant practice. This Israel Knight found out, when his mind had become biased in favor of the Baptist principle; he was met by his guardian thus: "What do you mean by being a Baptist? There are, as I presume you know, at least nine different divisions of this sect in our own country, viz: Regular Baptists, Free-will Baptists, Six-principle Baptists, Disciples or Campbellites, Seventh-day Baptists, Winebrennarians, Anti-Mission Baptists, Christians and Dunkers," p. 47. Now which? A somewhat similar fate befell him when he had landed among the Congregationalists, and he found only the want of harmony, while in conversation with two Congregational clergymen. "We do not all interpret Scripture alike," said Mr. O'Hara. "I am pastor of an Evangelical Congregational Church, so called, but our Creed is so worded, that, while we are guilty of all these doctrines, we offend in none, I believe."

"Israel now rose to leave. He thanked both the clergymen for their instruction." Mr. O'Hara said, "If you make up your mind that you must be immersed, and yet wish for a more liberal scope of church membership than the Baptist, you can come to me and I will willingly do it."

"I would *not* do it," said Mr. Ingersoll, "for I do not believe it is necessary."

"Neither do I," said O'Hara, laughing, "but then conscience not of thine own, but of the other." p. 94. Ah!

This same principle is illustrated once and again, in the fruitful history of the sects, more concerned on self-glory and praise than the upholding of the earnest doctrines of the Cross of Christ. This spirit of self does not belong to true Christianity, but is an admixture of an element foreign to it, which must needs be winnowed out, and it stands in the way, or at least is made an excuse, while there may be a remaining out of the church, and a failure to discharge duty, which is solemnly enjoined on every one in the Word of God.

In addition to this, we find varied doctrines, and a want of the Christian grace of charity. In every denomination, ostensibly moving under the same banner, there should be, at least, some principle to cement and unite together. But even this fails. When Israel Knight had been brought under the influence of Congregationalism, he had to learn this lesson: "I do not think that I fully understand the Articles of your Creed, which are necessary to be endorsed in order to become one of your number;" here spoke Israel. "Our churches do not all have the same creed," said Mr. O'Hara. "How is that?" asked Israel, somewhat astonished; "are you not all consociated upon terms of fraternal action and fellowship?" "O, yes; we fellowship each other upon essential points of faith. Each Church has a right to make or alter its own creed, however, while other churches can withdraw their fellowship, if they please." . . . p. 91. A similar experience he had among the Methodists. ". . . Less than ever, did he feel that he was *holy*." "With the doctrine of holiness," answered the man, "I have not much to do. It may be true, and it may not."

"What! then you, sir, are not a Methodist?" asked Israel.

"I've been a member of the Methodist Church since I was fifteen years old; I was converted at a place much like this," he replied.

"I thought all Methodists, that is, all who continue steadfast in the doctrine of the Church, believed and taught Holiness, or Christian Perfection," said Israel.

The man shook his head. "I suppose it's generally thought so," he said, "but not half of our people think much about it any way. . . . " pp. 132–33. In doubt now, as Israel was, some features of their faith and also of their practice commended themselves strongly to his approbation; of certain others he was in doubt, and yet others he wholly disliked, and to be relieved he wrote to his guardian Ephraim Stearns, for his advice. "· . . From this beginning, Methodism has become a power in our land. Eminent for its activity and numerical strength, like Ephraim, while it was trembling in

Israel it prospered; but as soon as it began to exalt itself in worldly pride, its spiritual power declined. Its present history is strangely inconsistent with its real life. Once it was adorned with humility and self-sacrifice; now it vaunts itself in gold and the tricks of mammon. It is second to no other sect in its aspirations for vain show. Its ministers adorn themselves with gold baubles, use great swelling words about the progress of their sect, and are all athirst for power," (pp. 137–138). Cyprian Cutting, a leader, said to Israel, "I only led the meeting in the absence of the preacher. Religion is in a very low state in our Church now." "I thought quite the contrary," said Israel, "it seemed to me there was a remarkable fervor prevailing." "Oh! you ought to have seen us last winter," said Cutting, smiling with an ecstatic joy, "when every single night of the week, scores fell down, cut to the heart; and on Sunday night we calculated we had done nothing, unless we could count seventy or eighty slain around our altar. O dear! our church members," he sighed, "are such stupid, blind guides; fools of heart, and slow to believe," (p. 111). Corresponding to Stearns' opinion, "Methodism is adapted to the ignorant and to the worldly-wise or managing leaders," (p. 138.)

As to illiberality, we have specimens among the Baptists. "It is not difficult to see how they can live in peace together in the same community (Baptists and Pædo-baptists), and mutually esteem and love each other, . . . but how they are to live and work harmoniously together in one Church fellowship, and under one Church law, is in theory a mystery past finding out, . . . for so long as our present difference of views continues, it would be a disgrace to us both if we could be cordially united in Church relations." (*Scripture Terms of Admission to the Lord's Supper*, by Rev. A. N. Arnold, D.D.). Among the Episcopalians he found out this: "We hold no other ministry to be valid than that which we trace as a direct succession from the Apostles, and no place of Divine worship to be truly consecrated except by such persons," answered his

friend, very gravely. . . . "But would you not also permit the attendance of a Baptist, a Congregational, or a Methodist clergyman?" pursued Israel. His friend shook his head. "No," said he, "not as Ministers of God, for that would be lending countenance to error. They are only laymen, made what they claim to be by men like themselves, and in some instances, not so good. Our ministers never permit these unauthorized men to come into their pulpits; neither are they ever found in theirs, more than they would go to any reading or lecture room." *Sic!* Shades of Henry the Eighth arise!

Whatever now may be said in favor of this form or phase of our present Protestantism, these facts cannot be ignored, but are spots on its existence, and it is not desirable that it should continue so. Who can fail to see, from what has been said, that it contains tendencies towards disintegration, and unless these can be counteracted, it must prove a disastrous failure? And whether it is pleasant or not, this lesson must be learned—it must be faced—studied, and by the help of God, resolved. As it is, the war waged is against itself, as can be shown by instance on instance; principles in the same denomination contending with each other, and so one denomination against the other, and all ostensibly marching under the shadow of the Cross, instead of presenting a united front, and in one solid phalanx march against the kingdom of evil and defeat and overcome it. It is felt, too, that this state of things is abnormal, in the efforts which are made to meet and correct it. Such examples we have in the Tract Society, the Evangelical Alliance, where different denominations meet on the same platform. But only imagine, an assemblage like that of the Evangelical Alliance, in which you have the heterogeneous elements—the discordant principles and practices which every denomination possesses—meeting on one common platform, and every one must at once see that it falls immeasurably short of what Unity means. Only think of it! to have the nine different forms of the Baptists represented—the endless phases of the Calvinistic Church, the high and low Episcopalians, with the

Quaker, Unitarian, *et id omne genus*, and you have the picture of which our worthy professor of Church History used to speak, when referring to these societies,* as "a meeting on a platform and outwardly shaking hands with each other." Such assemblages made up of parties squinting at each other, as is practically done, with a rivalry that would swallow up and devour each other, meeting, as the professor said, "outwardly," on a platform, with no power to legislate, no authority whatever, only to talk over the common interests, where each one can paint to suit his own fancy, only reveals the weakness of the system, which, in its impotency, can undertake nothing higher. It is the best that can be done, but that is little in comparison to the great interests that are at stake. How much better if our Protestantism could only see this, and own it!

But we must hold fast, amidst this endless diversity and confusion, to the fact, that the Church exists, and "that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her;" there is a Kingdom of God, which is here for the purposes of salvation, into which ark men are to enter, to be brought safely into the port of peace. There is no excuse; union with the Church is indispensable, and whether divided or not, it is true now as in ancient days—*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*

What is the Church?

Though Israel Knight made the round and came back where he started, out of the Church, notwithstanding this, *there is an Order* of Grace in the world, a Kingdom of God, instituted for holy and solemn purposes. This order is not nature elevated or refined, but an order distinct, acting in the world, and is supernatural. By the introduction of sin, man's whole nature became disordered and deranged. Even nature itself felt the force, and now "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now;" and it is evident at once that there is need for the supernatural, to restore the disorders of sin. In the birth of Christ we have the union of the Divine and human,

* Lectures on Church History, by Dr. P. Schaff.

and in His Person the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. "In the Person of Jesus Christ we have erected on earth a celestial institution, which is called the Kingdom of God, or of Heaven, and is in fact a perpetual, supernatural dispensatory of healing and salvation for the race. Christianity is, in his view, no mere scheme of doctrine, or of ethical practice, but is instead a kind of miracle, a power out of nature and above, descending into it; a historically supernatural movement on the world, that is visible, entered into it, and organized to be an institution in the person of Jesus Christ. He therefore is the central figure and power, and with Him the entire fabric either stands or falls." (Bushnell, *Natural and Supernatural*, p. 276). The Church, this Order of Grace, lies not in the sphere of nature, it is above it; it is not something to be reasoned out. Not for reflection, but an article of faith, and she is the mother of all God's children, born in her, nurtured by her, trained, disciplined, and in her warm bosom prepared for heaven. Such a conception, of course, was foreign to the mind of Israel Knight and his guardian, Ephraim Stearns, and with the larger part of our present Protestantism, he had no need for this Kingdom of Heaven, for the Church to give him spiritual life—no need for her in which to prepare him for heaven. She was to him only a place of safe keeping, after he imagined he had found in the world that which the Church alone can give.

The Church always insisted on unity, as there is one Lord, so but one Church. This is one of her distinctive attributes, and in our day far too little account is made of it. And yet it is asserted that there is unity, even in our manifold divisions, though fundamental truths are disbelieved and denied by some. Take for instance the Tract Society, or the Evangelical Alliance, with their one hundred and one shades of religious belief, and it will require mathematical genius of the highest order, to decipher where the unity is found or in what it resides. We are well aware of the reasons given—the arguments offered wherewith to justify this state of things, but they are insufficient—they give not unity. It is too true that, to a great extent, the doctrine of unity is not held as firmly as it should be, or there

is moral courage wanted to preach it to the people and make earnest account of it. Compare the present state of this doctrine with the belief, as held by early Christians, "That, therefore alone is the Catholic Church which retains the true worship. This is the fountain of truth, this is the home of the faith, this the temple of God, into which if any man enter not, or from which if any man go out, he is a stranger to the hope of life and everlasting salvation." Lactantius. "Do not err, my brethren, if any man follow a Schismatic, he shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. . . . . Take good heed then to partake of one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the uniting us in His blood, one altar." Ignatius. So Augustine, Cyprian, &c. "They held and taught that there is in the world one visible body, which is the Church. That its oneness consists in its having one origin, one object in faith, . . . one head, which is Christ."

Object of the Church. The Church as a Divine Institute possesses forces, which are not found in nature. She is not the place for the safe keeping of souls that are converted in the world, or have become Christians, as Israel Knight and thousands in our day, but as such an institute, she only can make us Christians. "Whosoever is separate from the Church is joined to an adulteress, he is severed from the promises of the Church, he is an alien, a profane man, and an enemy. He can no longer have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his Mother." St. Cyprian. She is truly the mother, as the Psalmist and the Apostle affirm, having spiritual nourishment for the soul in her divine means of Grace, and by means of these, in her Holy communion, the soul is to be fitted and prepared for heaven and for bliss. The door is opened for our entrance or initiation, by submitting to the initiatory rite, receiving baptism, that we may be placed into a condition, in her warm bosom, to profit by the grace bestowed in her blessed means.

And now having learned her to be this for the soul, we may see and appreciate the practical part of Dr. Harbaugh's little

volume, where he enjoins upon every one the solemn duty and necessity to become a Christian—to join the Church of Christ.

This little volume is especially intended for the common people. It makes no pretension to deep research—extensive learning, but is plain, practical and to the point, full of Christ and full of the Church. We shall notice a few of the objections commonly urged in justification of a course out of the Church. The second objection noticed is: There are so many bad professors of religion. The fact is readily admitted, but the force is turned against the objector by affirming that all members are not so, and that it is asking too much that the Church should be free from all unworthy professors. The case of "a thief," "son of perdition," and "one who denied the Saviour with cursing and swearing" is referred to, yet this fact did not make all the apostles unworthy. The same fact we find among the early Christians, presenting the case as stated by the Saviour Himself. "Let both grow together until the harvest." "If we only are wheat, all will be right even though we stand among tares." Then once more, "religion does not consist in outward forms, but in dispositions of the heart, and that therefore, we can be just as good out of the Church as in it." To this objection the Dr. replies: "The inward and outward in religion, are bound together, and God sustains the one by the other. The spirit needs the form, and the form needs the spirit. If the spirit is not there, the form is dead, and if the form is not used, the spirit departs. . . . The tree has an unseen hidden life, but also an outward form. The limbs and the bark are not the tree, for without the inward life they would be dead; but it is equally true that the inward life could not exist if it were not for the outward form—the bark and the limbs, take these away, and the life will soon withdraw. Now so it is in religion; forms are not religion, but they are the outward signs of it, and they are necessary to it. If we take them away, the life and spirit of religion will not stay, no more than the life of a tree will remain in it when the bark and limbs are taken away. . . . When He institutes forms and ordinances to bring us near to Him, who is he that says, 'we can be just as pious

and acceptable to God without them?'" pp. 50, 51. On the objection, "I am not good enough," the following reply is made. This is one of the common objections urged by the Anxious Bench system of religion. "You have wrong views of the Church. If you are to get all you need to make you a Christian without the aid of the Church, what use is there of the Church? It is the same as if a hungry man, invited to a table, should say, If I were full and satisfied, I would then sit down and eat. The Church like Christ Himself, comes not to save the righteous, but sinners. . . It is like an ark, those who would be saved, must come into it for that very purpose. They must not say, as the waters are gathering, If I were saved, I would enter it. No, enter it that you may be saved. . . . You are to be saved, not out of the Church, but in her. If you would be a Christian, you must use the means; these means are in the Church," pp. 59, 60.

After the objections, which are six in number, have been considered, the book turns to present positive arguments, why every one should unite with the Church, or make a profession of faith. These arguments we shall briefly notice. The first is. "It is your duty to join the Church because God has instituted it," . . . . "an institution, of which God is the author, leaves us no choice but to obey what it requires."

The second is, "He requires us to join the Church, by a public profession of religion, and enjoins it upon us as a duty. Gen. xvii. Mat. xxviii. 19, 20. In Mark xvi. 16, we are told what the consequences will be if we refuse to submit to this order. He that would be wiser than God in this respect, and is determined to take his own way, must meet the consequences." Mat. x. 32, 33. Luke xii. 8, 9.

The fourth is, It is necessary to be united with the Church, because, according to the Scriptures, *we are united to Christ through the Church.* . . . "Out of the Church, according to the apostle, we are like an arm, an ear, or an eye, out of the body—dead! . . As the body is between the limbs and the head, so the Church is between the members and Christ; and we can only be joined with Him through the Church. In the Church

is His Spirit and His grace. In the Church are the means by which we are to seek and to find union with Him. In the Church are His ministers to show the way to life; there are the Sacraments as nourishment, and signs and seals of His grace; and there are all the ordinances adapted and designed to renew us into His image, into perfect men in Christ." In reference to the question whether any one can be saved out of the Church, the Dr. makes the following just remark. "It is a useless question, and to such the Saviour Himself gave no answer. It is just as in that case where one came to Christ, and asked, 'Lord, are there few that be saved?' The Saviour answered his question by saying, 'Strive to enter in at the strait gate.' That is as much as if he had said, You have more important matters to engage your attention; whether few or many are saved, what is that to thee? See to it that *you* are saved. So here—if you ask, can no one be saved out of the Church? We answer, You can be saved *in* the Church; see that you do not neglect it," pp. 89, 90, 91.

Another reason, which stands the sixth in the book, is: "It is your duty to belong to the Church, because it is only in this way that you can stand *on the side of religion in the eyes of the world.*" . . . . "In this way vast injury is done by the silent, but effective power of example. Especially do parents, in this way, by their example, infuse into the minds of their children a secret disrespect for religion and its ordinances. There is not the least doubt that many children, growing up around uncovenanted parents, have been kept out of the Church and out of Heaven, just because they could silence the claims of religion upon them by the example of their parents. They may speak piously to their children; but what weight has that, so long as their own hearts are not led to obedience in what God requires of all in connection with His Church? The child will think thus: If you are sincere in speaking of the necessity of piety, why do not you profess it?" (pp. 100–101). Words worthy of being written indelibly on every parent's heart!

It will be seen from these extracts, that a person is not to be converted, or become a Christian in the world, and then start

out on a long and weary search for the Church as did Israel Knight, in the Book, "*Where is the City?*" but is directed to the Church for that very purpose as the place where you are to become such. We see also the field it traverses, and it is a pleasure to read such productions and to recommend them to others, believing that their mission is only for good. This little volume stands in the broad, wide stream of the Church, full of Christ and full of the Church, and is a gem sparkling on every page, enforcing personal duty on the reader. In the other volume, you look in vain for the Church. It has no Christ; it moves on the low plane of nature, and we cannot see where it is better than the heathenism of Seneca, of Socrates, or Plato. It makes the impression, that you become converted in the world and make your way to heaven without Baptism or the Lord's Supper, or any Ordained Means of Grace; that you can find in nature all you need for happiness here and hereafter, without entering the Church, uniting with her, or using the blessed heaven-ordained Means of Grace. From this theory and such a practice, Good Lord, forever deliver the people.

No. Let the Church stand fast in her glorious birth-right—her ancient, reformed faith. Let others do what they will, our motto is, "From the Family to the School, from the School to the Church, from the Church to Heaven."

ART. IV.—THE MINISTRY ADAPTED TO THE TIMES.*

BY D. GANS, D. D., NORRISTOWN, PA.

"And who is sufficient for these things?"—2 COR. ii. 16.

SUFFICIENT for what things? We have the answer given in the immediate context, "For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life." Hereupon follows the text: "And who is sufficient for these things?"

Very clearly then have we here presented, in a way well calculated to arrest the attention and chain our earnest thought, the Holy Ministry, first under its Apostolic character, which marks and measures strictly the supernatural period, and second the same ministry under the form of its historical continuance from that time to the end of days. The latter *period*, though differing from the first in form, is yet not different from it in the way of life or substance. The Holy Ministry, essentially from Christ and formally from the Church, as His mystical body, is, as it necessarily must be, always superhuman. Its work, intrinsically considered, is ever the same, and the effects which flow from it are, in all periods, substantially alike. It is now, no less than in the days of the Apostles, the savor of life unto life, or of death unto death, according as men, either by their faith or unbelief, may relate themselves to it. It is necessarily the continuance, in a real and unbroken way, of the original ministry from Christ given to the Apostles, and by them to their successors, and carries in it as such, every material element that is involved in the first and only commission.

Still, as in no natural department of being is the historical *ongoing* precisely the same as the *beginning*, so neither is it the

* A sermon preached before the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, at the Annual Commencement, May 10th, 1870. Published by request.

same absolutely in the case of the Ministry. The process of history is the naturalization, so to speak, of forces that acted originally under a purely supernatural form. By this it is not meant that these forces become weakened, that the supernatural has become suppressed, or that in some way that in them which transcends nature has evaporated; but that the supernatural, connecting with the historical onward flow of things, acts now in the natural, and in a manner more strictly conformable to the natural.

It is particularly in view of this fact, that the way becomes properly open for the question, "Who is sufficient for these things?" It is here taught that there exists a close connection between man as man, and the Divinity involved in the Ministry as such, and especially its proper work, in connection with the effects that flow from it. Who, as man simply, or even as angel, is sufficient to bear such supernatural power and assume such vast and tremendous responsibility? Evidently no one. And yet it is man, and not an angel, who is called to the work; nor yet is he often the greatest or the strongest among men that is called, in the sense in which strength and greatness are usually estimated; for it has pleased God, whose thoughts are higher than our thoughts, to choose the weak things of the world to confound those that are mighty, in order that it might be fully manifest, even to the natural understanding, that the excellency and power are of God and not of man. Man, as such, becomes a meet bearer of this mighty power just in proportion as he loses confidence in himself, as he seeks to hide his own strength, as he empties himself and becomes truly humble, and as he comes in this way to possess in large measure the life and spirit and power of his Lord. Only properly to the extent that Christ is in him as a personal Saviour for himself, as well as officially in the full and free exercise of holy functions for others beyond himself, is he, or can he be, sufficient for the work which has been entrusted to his hands. St. Paul, elsewhere, gives the true answer to the question which he asks in the text, by saying first, "When I am weak, then am I strong"

(2 Cor. xii. 10), and second, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." (Phil. iv. 13).

I wish, now and here, to speak as briefly as possible upon the theme: THE MINISTRY ADAPTED TO THE TIMES.

From this point we may view the Ministry in its two leading aspects—first, in those aspects that are unchangeable, always the same, and second, in those that are changeable, and do change from age to age. Both these sides enter into the question of adaptation, and should receive our prayerful consideration.

I. Under the unchangeable aspects of the Ministry, we comprehend everything that is essential to its nature and functions as such—namely, its original divinity, its historical continuity in the bosom of the Church, and its functions in relation to the Word of God on the one hand, and to the Holy Sacraments on the other. Its original divinity forms, of course, its internal and essential nature, without which it would not and could not be a ministry; its historical continuity is the only form in which this, its essential nature, can be perpetuated, so as to make it real for every age; and the Word of God, as the record of inspired truth, on the one hand, and the Holy Sacraments, as the organs of its life and grace, on the other, are the two great means by which the ministry comes into actual contact, in a saving way, with the world.

In this view, there is of course no room for the idea of accommodation in the sense of change. That which is essential cannot change, at least not so as to substitute for its original nature another nature. Nor is there in this view any peculiarity attaching to any age or people that can properly call for adaptation of this sort on the part of the ministry. Man's essential wants, in a spiritual point of view, as also in the natural, are the same in all the periods of the world's life. He is everywhere in sin, and needs deliverance from it; he is separated from God, and needs, through the redemption that is in Christ, to be re-united with Him. This is the end, instrumentally, of the Holy Ministry in its essential nature and material functions; and must, therefore, in this view, be regarded as being

already from the beginning, and in its own nature, adapted in the very best and most perfect manner to its work for each and every age alike. Deny its essential divinity, and in this, its proper supernatural character, with a view to bring it down to the sense of mere Naturalism, for instance, or Rationalism, and so seek to adapt it to an unbelieving age or people, or have it to act through anything else than the Word of God and the Holy Sacraments, as for instance, science, or literature, or art, in order to make it more popular, and it is not difficult to see, that its entire power is at once gone, and that its true adaptation to men as sinners needing salvation, is wholly destroyed.

What is needed in this view for the present age, is the clear sense of this unchanging character of the ministry, or a deep and steady apprehension of its inward, divine and fundamental nature—not an effort to adapt it to our being and wants, but a faith to see that by its own nature it is so adapted already in the most real and perfect way.

Nothing, however, is more sadly apparent in the present age than the fact that the true nature of the ministry, in the aspect of it now under consideration, is most sadly misunderstood. Any one, it is now widely believed, who is possessed of ordinary personal piety, and with this a desire to edify his fellow-men religiously, is fully prepared to act in this department. But little thought is expended upon the divine origin and supernatural official investiture of the ministry. Ordination, according to this view, is regarded as an impressive formality, good enough in its way and place, but in no sense necessarily connected with anything vital or essential, either as it respects the nature or functions of the ministry. If personal piety is at hand, it is concerned earnestly for nothing besides. In the view of this faith, the minister, substantially, would be just as complete without ordination as with it. The Holy Ministry is thus regarded as being on a flat level with any other merely mental profession, only that its intellectual qualifications need not be so high or rigorous as either that of Law or Medicine, or even that of the ordinary school-teacher.

This is the nature of much of the thinking and feeling upon this subject to which the present age is largely abandoned. The Holy Ministry, as coming from Christ and involving the supernatural elements of His own character, as Prophet, Priest and King, and as continuing perpetually in the form of an unbroken succession in the bosom of the Church, without the loss of any of its own essential grace, is, in this view, entirely surrendered, and in the place of it another is sought to be set up, altogether without regard to anything that has ever existed before bearing a like name.

Of course such faith, as might naturally be expected, is equally independent as respects the legitimate functions and duties of the ministry. Its pride is to be free and original. It can preach as effectually from Shakespeare or Milton as from St. Matthew or St. John. True, it affects, at periodic intervals, great feelings of earnestness in glorifying the Bible, but with all this, it is never found to make real earnest with its great principles and doctrines. For these it has a constitutional disrelish. Whilst it swears by the Bible, it serves other gods, in fact. Earnest, plain, practical expositions of its grand principles are never seriously aimed at. To it, this is always intolerably dry and unsavory. Its mission, in strict accordance with its own human, individualistic nature, lies, as its effort usually indicates, wholly in the sphere of the *sensational.* Whatever is best calculated to produce this result in the most vivid form, is, for it, in the fullest sense, the great power of God. Accordingly it is found to enter naturally into every tide of excitement that may roll over the land, without any regard to its nature, and it is always with the tide. It seizes largely upon the disasters of the day—shipwrecks, earthquakes and murders. These are its gospels, as regularly chaptered as those of Luke or Mark, and, as a general rule, far better understood and more forcibly treated. It is the individual simply, acting upon the individual, with the hope of accomplishing in this way, the same extraordinary results that flowed originally from the words and acts of Christ and His Apostles.

Still more independent, if possible, as all can readily see, does this faith make the ministry of the Holy Sacraments. Indeed it finds it exceedingly difficult to make room for these at all, except as mere outward formulas or signs of some individual results which have been brought about in another way. This faith even makes a pious merit to laugh at any hope, however intelligently entertained, that Holy Baptism may be, in an inward and real way, connected with the beginning of spiritual life, and that the Holy Supper should, in any similar manner, be concerned with its nurture, expansion and growth. So far as it makes any earnest account of these ordinances at all, it does this by regarding them as signs on the one hand, pointing to what pious men as such have accomplished, and as seals on the other, to ratify and confirm, in the eyes of the world, their work. It is never found, in the way of fact, even when it ascends to the highest branch in its faith, to appreciate, in any deep and true way, the sacramental work of the ministry in its own nature, or feel earnestly that in its acts, as connected with these sacraments, it is stamping character as with a divine seal or moulding it, by the force of their own inherent laws, for eternity. These, for this faith, never constitute a savor of life unto life or of death unto death.

Thus, in the light of a false faith claiming to be guided by a superior science to that known in the past, has the supernatural ministry from Christ been substituted by one that is natural merely and from man; and so completely divorced, in idea and steady faith at least, has the latter become from the former, that many even jeer at the thought that the legitimacy of the latter ministry should, even in the slightest degree, depend upon its connection with the former.

Is the ministry of Religion, so regarded, whether by themselves or by those among whom they are exercising their functions, sufficient for these things? The question needs but to be asked to secure for it its proper answer. How can it, in this light, be the ministry that Christ ordained; and how can any other actualize its purposes and accomplish its ends? Even our Saviour Himself could perform no mighty work in the face

of an unbelief less radical than this. Here the attempt has been to accommodate that part of the ministry which by its own nature is unchangeable—the same like the light and the atmosphere, for all ages; to adapt it, not to any real or essential wants of men, which, in this view, are also the same through all generations, but to artificial wants created by unbelief, which, even were they gratified, would leave men still without bread, and we may add, without God and without hope also in the world. These common and substantial wants remaining the same now as they were at first, when the ministry was instituted with its supernatural character, is it to be supposed that they can be met, in any sense corresponding with their demand, by a ministry whose substantial nature it is believed has thus been changed, or whose supernatural power has, at least in the faith of men, given place to one that is purely natural? As well might we suppose that the atmosphere and light and water, changed in a similar way to something different from their original constitution, could, in the respects to which they apply, meet and satisfy man's wants now.

This low, unhistorical and false faith touching the ministry has had its trial. Has it added anything to the spiritual efficiency of the ministry? Has it opened the way for greater respect and deeper reverence in reference to its own nature? Has it led the mind to look with a more implicit confidence upon the instrumentality which God has appointed for the salvation of men? Has it to a greater extent turned men to the Church, —the house of bread—to the preaching of the Word, to the administration of the Holy Sacraments? Has it, in any sense, more inwardly and fully related the Ministry to the real wants of men, which constitute the heavy and common burden of the soul?

Just the opposite, in all these respects, is true, and must be so acknowledged on all hands. The ministry, modified and ruled by this faith, has not been sufficient for these things. Perhaps there never has been a time prior to the present, when the ministry, as such, was less regarded, and when it was more fully shorn of its legitimate influence and power. So far as this faith extends, is it found practically to lack the divinity for

which the common want cries. It is helpless in the bosom of the great demand, or like the feeble effort of the magician, as compared with that of the real miracle-worker; and this same false faith, now beginning to see this, is losing confidence in the whole conception of the Ministry, and even laboring in some direction to get it out of the way altogether, as a clog upon the wheels of progress. This has been the result of seeking to accommodate what by its own nature cannot be changed but by the hand of destruction.

Here now the question arises, what must be the character of the ministry, in this view, if it would be adapted to the times? The answer may be given in a few words. The true and essential glory of the ministry must again be made to confront the faith of men. The false faith by which the ministry has become unadapted to our common want, must be superseded by the true faith, which takes the ministry in its unchanged character and original fulness. The ministry for the times, so far as its proper nature is concerned, must carry in it, in its general bearing and tone, the power of a bold re-affirmation of its divine origin, supernatural character and gracious functions. The faith of men must be made to view and receive it as still the great official medium through which Christ Himself speaks and acts; to believe that the language can be uttered now by the humblest of God's servants, with the same real truth that attended its utterance on the part of the greatest Apostle: "Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." 2 Cor. v. 20.

This, manifestly, must be the tone and character of the ministry, if it would penetrate the artificial coverings of the human heart and meet in a real way the radical want which is felt; if it would show the folly and wickedness of infidelity touching the grand ministerial commission and the vital powers of grace; if it would bring back the mind that has wandered away, to the central mysteries of redemption, and create in it respect for and confidence in its own official work; in a word, if it would be a real divine power, and, as such, sufficient for these things.

Christ ordained but *one* ministry, when He said, after having triumphed actually over death, hell and the grave, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye *therefore;*" and it is certain that only this ministry, and none other, this in all its original plenitude of power, can be adapted to the times, and be sufficient, both to do the work and bear the responsibility of it, whether it result as a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death.

II. But we turn now to the other aspects of the ministry, those in regard to which it may, and, in point of fact, does change from age to age.

Under these we comprehend what, as distinguished from the other, may be called the human side of the ministry, which involves everything that may enter into it in the way of physical adaptation, moral disposition, and especially mental endowments and intellectual culture; although, of course, in a discourse like the present, we can have time to involve them only in the most general way. These belong not to the essence of the ministry as from Christ, but are nevertheless essentially important in their own nature.

These aspects are, in the nature of the case, changeable. In no two ages of the Church's history have they been the same. No two ministers, in the same age, are, in regard to these, or any one of them, in all respects alike. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all." 1 Cor. xii. 4–6. The original diversity that distinguished the twelve Apostles has, like the ripple started by the pebble cast into the ocean, spread and expanded, until it has reached the utmost boundary. This is true especially in regard to the higher aspects, mental culture and moral tone. Each past age has, in this respect, carried in it peculiar wants and presented new demands, which it was the mission of the ministry, in that age, to meet and satisfy; and we may learn from the pages of history how well or ill they performed their work.

What, in this view, must be the ministry, if it would be

adapted in the best form to the present times? The answer to the question must be sought for and found in the times themselves. And

1. In relation to mental culture. We do not hold it to be essential, or in any way strictly necessary, nor yet even desirable, that the whole ministry of Christ should receive the same thorough, high and finished education, even in any age. This has, in point of fact, never been the case in any period of the Church, nor in any of the sections into which it has been divided. Various are her demands, arising from her various conditions in different localities. The Church, besides, as Catholic, has always made ample room for all normal gifts and tendencies; and not unfrequently has it been the case, that the most meagre in the way of mental endowments and the most poorly furnished in the form of educational armament and polish, but with sound minds and healthy bodies, with the love of God in the heart and the care of souls on the conscience, have accomplished more in the way of pushing forward the ark and planting the Cross in the wilderness, than any equal number of highly educated men, with their delicate sense of refinement and strong love to study adhering to them, could possibly have done.

All this, however, constitutes, of course, no argument against a fully educated ministry. It is the exception, not the rule, and is true even of such, only as they were fortunate enough to find their own place and were blessed with humility to occupy it in the fear of God. Christianity and education have always been closely allied, in some sort like David and Jonathan, the latter ever following and flourishing in the wake of the former; and upon no interest outside of Christianity proper, has the ministry expended more untiring labor and zealous devotion, than that whose end is the enlargement and educational development of the human intellect.

The Holy ministry, now, to meet the advanced condition of mental emancipation and intellectual culture, is necessitated to plant itself upon very elevated and broad ground. Not only are the times distinguished in a peculiar sense for free inquiry and general mental energy, perhaps altogether beyond anything

that has been known in the past, but also for boldness and reckless daring. Nor can any easily fail to perceive that this advanced mind has, to a very large extent, abandoned the simple faith of the gospel, and is seeking, on the ground of the bare understanding, to penetrate and fathom the wonders of being. What it cannot, in this way, embrace and master it rejects, or regards as belonging to the mythical regions of credulity or superstition. Thus has it already entered, partially at least, nearly all the domains of thought—science, philosophy, history, theology, general literature, and even the pure revelation of God, resting entirely on the inspiration of the Spirit. That errors of the gravest character should be the result, withering alike to our natural, social and spiritual being, is only what might be expected. We cannot stop to enumerate these, or to show, in a specific way, how fatally they strike at the true well-being of the race in all that vitally concerns it, whether for this or the next world.

It is from facts such as are here comprehended, that the demand arises in reference to the ministry for the times. These fatal dogmas coming in the name of boastful science, which have to a large extent substituted the great doctrines of the gospel and are now connected with the disintegrating and deathward practical tendencies which have grown out of them, must be met. They must be met by a positive, stern and firmly grounded opposition. This can be done effectually only by the Christian ministry—the Christian ministry, however, equally advanced in learning, but with a higher, purer and nobler faith. The times require no ministry to re-echo the sentiments simply of mere vague naturalism, or to give back to the people their own marred moral image, as formed by degrading Rationalism, or a short-lived human tradition. They demand a ministry which, in its essential constitution, comes from above, stands fully in an order of life beyond the world of nature, and which, at the same time, on the score of educational ability, is able to spread the light of this life through every crevice of our mere world-being, and thus show how all things centre vitally in the cross

of Christ, and how the whole, thus centred, belongs to each Christian.

It is the positive truth in its full and high form, that vanquishes error. The ministry for the times must therefore advance boldly to a high intellectual position, and not fear to stand side by side with the savans of the age. It must be able to follow the false Astronomer, as he walks among the stars, and show his error; to descend with the false Geologist, as he wanders amidst the rocks, and point out his departure; to stand with equal ease and freedom with the perverting historian at the original sources of history, and demonstrate his digression; to follow the sophistical logician, step by step, in the most intricate processes of logic, and reveal, by its power, the fallacy of his conclusions; to feel at home fully in the vast field of Theology, ancient and modern, so as to understand clearly the relation of all the leading principles in the great system of Christianity; and last, though not least, he must be able to enter, like a prince into his own palace, the revelation of God, in its own languages, and be familiar generally with all the early customs, modes of thought and feeling and literature, early and late, which pertain to it.

This is the demand, summarily, of the present times upon the Christian ministry. Well may we exclaim in view of it, who is sufficient for these things? Upon no other class of men is the demand so great and broad. In this view, as almost in every other, the Christian ministry is altogether peculiar. It is only in the strength of Christ, who is the mind of all science, the life of all history, and the heart of all theology, that it is in any sense possible for the ministry to respond to its call. The true glory of the ministry lies always in the greatness of its work, the performance of which, like a miracle, points to Christ, who works in and through them, of whom it is said, "He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet." 1 Cor. xv. 25.

2. The demand of the times in relation to the moral tone of the ministry. Here, no less than in the case of intellectual equipment, is the general pressure of the times broad and

peculiar. It requires vigorous and decided moral character; a deep and unwavering conviction of the truth as it is in Jesus, as the only power competent to free the mind; and above all, a moral courage, coupled, of course, with a true prudence, that shall not falter in the plain, clear and unequivocal annunciation of the truth, however distasteful it may be to an age infected with lying vanities. The ministry adapted to the times must be able to stand firm, like a great rock amid the strong currents of abnormal and wrong tendencies, and be unmoved even while these seem to carry everything helplessly before them. Its faith must be greater than its fear. Such a ministry may expect opposition, and must be prepared to meet it; they may look for persecution, and must have the moral heroism to bear it for the sake of Christ. The position is not a sinecure in any sense, or one calculated, in any view, to be pleasantly fanned by the popular breeze of the world. Great in every form are the labor and personal responsibility of the true witnesses for Christ, as they seek to fulfill their mission amid the errors, theoretical and practical, which are incorporated with the times, and they must be fully resolved, relying on the promised grace of Christ, to meet and bear all, counting themselves happy in the privilege of suffering with the Master.

The demand of the times is not indeed entirely peculiar in this view, for thus has the ministry always been tried, more or less severely. This demand is not as severe now as it was at some former periods, when imprisonment was common, when property was confiscated, and life itself was the price of speaking boldly the whole truth. But it is more severe than at some other periods, when the mind was less active, the interests of infidelity were less hopeful and less deeply felt, and when the true faith generally, at least in a traditional way, more fully governed the thoughts and feelings of men. The heroism particularly which is now required in the ministry consists in ability to forego popular applause, which has for many almost an omnipotent power; to prefer to be right, with persecution, rather than to be successful and admired in any scheme that is abnormal and wrong; to stand unmoved before the sight of his

own apparent failure in the clear bosom of the truth, and the seeming success of all false movements around him; to wait and pray, possessing his soul in patience, in the bosom of the deep and steady conviction, that only that will stand finally which is Christ-wrought, and only that will be successful in the end, which rests upon the eternal truth of God.

Here again, the exclamation may well be made, Who is sufficient for these things? The answer is, none but those who have supernatural grace from Christ to follow Him; first to death, and then to life. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." "Behold," says our Lord, "I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye, therefore, wise as serpents and harmless as doves."

To you, young gentlemen of the Seminary, who constitute, in part, the prospective ministry of the Church, the whole subject, now imperfectly sketched, is especially replete with interest. It shows you, to some limited extent, the field and the work to which you are looking forward. To the truly pious and brave in heart there is nothing in it depressing or discouraging, but much that is stimulating and truly inspiring. The true soldier wants to know his antagonist, and the stronger he is found to be, the more deeply does he become inspired with the spirit of encounter. To such, the view now given, opens the most inviting field. It indicates a work that is worthy of your highest gifts, your greatest efforts, and a sphere of trial that demands your hardiest courage. Let it be your ambition, first of all, to understand the times properly in their relation to the two aspects of the Ministry as now presented, and then to be ministers, of such mental and moral order, as will fairly meet the times in all the breadth and severity of the demand which arises from them—"Workmen that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of God."

In order to this, let not your zeal lead you that can possibly avoid it, to hasten or abbreviate your course of preparation. Let no examples mislead you on this point. The longest course is exceedingly short in view of a mission so grand and labor so

arduous. You cannot be too thoroughly prepared, if you would accomplish your life-work well. Be satisfied with no surface knowledge merely, in any of the departments of study in which you are now engaged, but sound them to their depths, and master them in all their relations. You will find ample room in the Church, in view of the peculiar nature of the times, for your most accurate scholarship and your profoundest acquisitions.

But with all, and far above all, let it never be forgotten that your real sufficiency for this work of God in the world must come from Christ, the Great Pastor, first in the form of deep, steady, personal piety, and second, in your formal investiture of the Holy Office, by prayer and the laying on of hands. Live, therefore, as candidates for this high and holy position, as in His life. Consecrate yourselves, each day, in body, soul and spirit, to Him and His work, and endeavor to realize to some adequate extent, as you approximate the goal of your preparation of labor, the high and glorious position to which you will then rise—that of being co-workers with Christ in the salvation of men.

And now unto Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, be all honor and glory in the Church through Jesus Christ, world without end. Amen.

Art. V.—WHAT IS HEAVEN?

BY REV. F. A. GAST, A. M.

It admits of no question that our current notions of heaven, as embodied in many hymns, fostered by countless sermons, and unfolded in various books of practical religion, are extremely vague and unsatisfactory. They are so dreamy, oftentimes so dreary, that they inevitably repel every earnest soul that feels stirring within it the energies of life. It would seem that distance here, as elsewhere, destroys the sharp, bold outline of the objects of contemplation, and surrounds them with a haziness in which they appear confused or indistinct. For the popular mind, heaven is a far-off realm of shades, so little akin to earth and so much out of sympathy with our sublunary life—in a word, so totally dissimilar to all that we experience while in the flesh, that it presents no clear, well-defined image which thought can grasp. The vast majority of Christians have no other conception of heaven than that of an unspeakable glory, which they dimly represent to themselves as a boundless, unfathomable ocean of light and bliss in which the soul eternally bathes.

It will hardly be denied that this is the view commonly entertained. But there are other minds, which, dissatisfied with a heaven so far removed from the visible, tangible realities of our mundane existence,—a heaven that seems to them at best but a prolonged dream, blissful, indeed, and undisturbed, yet only a dream—demand a home that shall be more in harmony with the totality of their nature, and where all their energies shall be called into play. Believing that redemption, far from destroying, perfects man, and unable, therefore, to conceive that the active powers drop out of the constitution of glorified saints when they enter the mansions of the Blessed, they crave a life that shall be more than a holy rapture and an ecstasy of joy,—a life that shall realize itself, not amid, airy unsubstan-

tial nothings, but in a definite locality, whose scenes are as real as they are beautiful,—that shall bring with it the sweetness of social intercourse, which throws such a charm around our life on earth,—that shall not be wholly passed in meditation and repose, but be full, round, complete, harmonious, affording healthy exercise to all the activities essential to man. And in this they are undoubtedly right. An eternity of lifeless inaction and monotonous repose can possess no attractions for an earnest mind. The best instincts of the soul rebel against a state of being which is little better than the pantheistic dream of absorption in deity.

But minds of this class, when they turn away from the abstract spiritualistic conception of heaven so widely prevalent in the Christian world, too generally err in the opposite direction, and fail to comprehend the peculiarity of the future life in its contrast with the life on earth. It is not that they make heaven too real,—the Bible represents it as intensely real; but that they make it to be only earth—earth purified, indeed, from evil, but still only earth. The heavenly life, as they describe it, is simply a reflection of the earthly life. They may locate the home of the redeemed at an almost infinite distance from this terrestrial globe; they may seek for it at the farthest limit of an apparently illimitable creation; yet they may see in it only a continuation of the same modes of life, with the same forms of thought and action, which characterize our existence in its present stage. On the other hand, we may believe that the everlasting dwelling-place of God's saints will be this earth, and yet regard heaven as qualitatively, not merely quantitatively, different in all its features from earth as we know it in our daily experience,—for we may look forward with prophecy to the time when our globe shall pass through a second birth, undergo a strange metamorphosis, and attain to a wondrous glorification by means of which it shall be divested of the earthly, and shall put on the image of the heavenly.

The subject is one of absorbing interest. Perhaps no inquiries have such fascination for the mind of frail, mortal man, as those that relate to the life beyond the grave. There

are times in the history of us all—times of weariness, loneliness, and sorrow—when we eagerly strive to pierce the vail, and when with awful earnestness we ask about that eternal home to which we are hastening with such rapid pace.

It is not a matter of idle curiosity or vain speculation. A right conception of heaven, its true nature and distinctive character, is of the highest practical importance. Who that has formed the acquaintance of intelligent men, especially of the young men of our day, and been admitted into the privacy of their inner thoughts and feelings, can for a moment doubt that the dreary views of heaven, so often unfolded in the modern pulpit, are productive of incalculable harm, and are responsible in a large measure for that lamentable indifference, if not indeed hostility to the Gospel, which prevails among the educated classes? If you paint heaven as a vague, indefinite state of holiness and bliss, an eternal trance of souls floating in indescribable light, can you wonder that those who feel the pulses of life beating high in their hearts, turn away from the picture with disgust? It is no dislike of the spiritual in its true form, it is only a repugnance to the ghostly, that leads them to reject such a heaven as a dead waste of existence and an intolerable void. Life in any case means motion, activity; the highest life, they think, must mean the highest motion and activity. There are those, indeed, who can see no reality or earnestness in the eternal life promised in the Scriptures, since it has in it no interests that conflict, no hindrances to be removed, and no sufferings to be endured. These, they think, are necessary incentives to all moral life. Such a view—and it is the view of pantheism which regards evil as an essential factor of the world's life—makes heaven a beautiful, ravishing dream, the realization of which is forever impossible. But the good is misconceived by those who think that, in order to its development, it needs the companionship of evil. It involves in its conception the most energetic activity. For this very reason, however, heaven must be more than a Sabbatic rest, in which the spirits of just men made perfect are engaged only in acts of meditation and adoring love. And if this is the everlasting

life to which we ask men to aspire, many will say, what still more will feel, that it gives them the impression of unendurable tedium, and that, fearing to sink into a spiritless, lethargic state, with the loss of their individuality, they have no wish to partake of its proffered joys.

If then, avoiding the error of this bald spiritualism and borrowing our imagery from the earthly paradise, we represent heaven as a garden of delights, yielding every imaginable enjoyment to sense, we may feel assured that all who are capable of rising above mere animal pleasures and of appreciating the worth of man's higher nature, will be repelled by the picture as unworthy of rational, moral, personal beings made in the image of God. No Mohammedan paradise, though it should infinitely surpass the most gorgeous conceptions of the Oriental fancy, could ever prove a heaven to a creature endowed like man. Made for union and communion with God, the higher needs of his spirit would continually assert themselves, and however lovely the scenery presented to his eye, or however melodious the music wafted to his ear, he would be the subject of an eternal unrest.

What, then, is heaven? This is the question we propose to answer in the present article; and, aiming as we do, simply to give the general conception of heaven as distinguished from earth and other spheres of creation lying beyond the confines of the celestial space, we shall leave untouched a multitude of special questions relating as well to the locality of the Father's house as to its inner life, individual and social.

It is evident from the most hasty glance at the Bible, that heaven is a definite place, a visible, tangible place, having well-marked limits and all the reality that corporeity can give. In many features of its life it resembles our life on earth, presenting itself to the view under a double aspect as both physical and ethical, natural and spiritual, real and ideal. We should greatly err if we regarded it as a realm *wholly* foreign to our present experience. As something *absolutely new*, with no affinity at all with earth, it would be difficult to see how man, retaining his distinctive nature, could feel at home within its

blessed precincts. There must either be a break in the continuity of his life, or heaven must be in harmony with the essential characteristics of his being. It is no less evident, however, that it stands in marked contrast with earth, not only so far as it is the sphere of spotless purity and unspeakable joy, but also, and more especially, in the form and manifestation of its inner life, as well as in the outward locality which that life illumines with its light and glory. Far from being simply a reproduction and copy of this lower world, it is rather something new relatively to the modes of our mundane existence. True, man in heaven is still man with body, soul and spirit; but there he is man glorified and exalted to the highest plane of created being.

In comparing heaven with earth, it is necessary to recognize both the identity and the difference, both the resemblance and the contrast. Each truth, duly estimated, must be united with the other in a living, harmonious way. There is constant danger, however, of divorcing what is thus inwardly joined together, and the sundering of the two truths inevitably leads to partial, defective, erroneous views. By laying all emphasis upon the identity and ignoring the difference, we reach a one-sided *realistic* conception; as by fastening our attention upon the contrast and keeping in the background the resemblance, we reach a one-sided *idealistic* conception.

According to the realistic view, heaven is only a brighter, purer reflection of earth. Profoundly impressed with the unity of human existence, it fails to draw a sharp dividing-line between its several stages, and recognizes in the life above merely the continuation of the life below. That, indeed, is an advance on this, but an advance in degree rather than in kind—as the maturity of manhood is an advance on the helplessness and inexperience of childhood. Our spiritual being, its forms of activity and its modes of development, are substantially the same in eternity as in time. Given a sphere, where sin casts no dark or baleful shadow, where pain, sorrow and death can find no entrance, and where, amid scenes of beauty and transports of delight, man may make illimitable progress in virtue and

truth, always pursuing, yet never attaining, an ever-receding goal: and we at once have heaven as it presents itself to the realistic view. It is the Paradise of Adam and Eve before their fall. The eye is directed not so much to the future as to the past; the heart longs for the restoration of a golden age and a lost Eden.

The loftiest and noblest conception of the home beyond the grave that the unaided mind of Paganism could form, was embodied in the Hesperian gardens and Elysian fields—regions blessed with perpetual spring, clothed with eternal verdure, enameled with beautiful flowers, shaded by pleasant groves and refreshed by never-failing fountains, where the righteous, communing with each other and bathing in light, live in perfect felicity and enjoy an immortality of bliss. Nor could Mohammedanism rise higher. Its Paradise, on which were lavished all the charms so fascinating to the poetic imagination of the East, was only "an ecstatic dream of pleasure, filled with sparkling streams, honeyed fountains, shady groves, precious stones, all flowers and fruits, blooming youths, circulating goblets, black-eyed houris, incense, brilliant birds, delightsome music, unbroken peace." But it is not alone in the pages of Homer, or Virgil, or the Koran, that we find the home of the blessed depicted in this realistic way; even in the Christian world heaven is not unfrequently painted in colors, less sensuous, indeed, yet still earthly and unspiritual. As described by Swedenborg, it is the exact counterpart of earth. The delineation of Dick, in his "Philosophy of a Future State," gives the impression that heaven is a grand school, where the saints, like the philosophers of this world, are mainly engaged in scientific investigations. Dissatisfied with the prevailing, irrational representations of the celestial home, as though the redeemed will there be assembled in one vast crowd above the visible concave of the sky, adorned with starry crowns, drinking at crystal fountains, making the vault of heaven ring with their loud acclamations, and incessantly gazing at the Redeemer who is suspended, like a statue, in the heavens, above this immense crowd, crowned with diadems and encircled with a refulgent

splendor—he aimed to set forth that home in a light more attractive, because more in harmony with our present modes of thought, feeling and action. And as he believed that his telescope revealed a central sun, vastly larger than all the suns and systems of suns that fill the immensity of space, it was here, in this capital of the universe, so grand in its proportions, so overwhelming in its power, and so glorious in its appearance, that he placed the throne of God and the heaven of God's saints. "From this glorious center embassies may be occasionally dispatched to all surrounding worlds, in every region of space. Here, too, deputations from all the different provinces of creation may occasionally assemble, and the inhabitants of different worlds mingle with each other, and learn the grand outlines of those physical operations and moral transactions which have taken place in their respective spheres. Here may be exhibited to the view of unnumbered multitudes, objects of sublimity and glory which are nowhere else to be found within the wide extent of creation. Here intelligences of the highest order, who have attained the most sublime heights of knowledge and virtue, may form the principal part of the population of this magnificent region. Here the glorified body of the Redeemer may have taken its principal station, as the head of all principalities and powers; and here likewise, Enoch and Elijah may reside in the meantime, in order to learn the history of the magnificent plans and operations of Deity, that they may be enabled to communicate intelligence respecting them to their brethren of the race of Adam, when they shall again mingle with them in the world allotted for their abode, after the general resurrection. Here the *grandeur* of the Deity, the glory of His physical and moral perfections, and the immensity of His empire, may strike the mind with a more bright effulgence, or excite more elevated emotions of admiration or rapture, than in any other province of universal nature."* Here the ransomed children of earth, beside their acts of worship and praise, learn the abstract principles of mathematics, study the wondrous revelations of astronomy, explore the mys-

* Philosophy of a Future State, p. 225.

teries of philosophy, chemistry and physiology—in short, prosecute the entire round of natural and moral sciences. The higher life is only the reflex of the lower life, viewed especially on its intellectual side. The same remark is applicable to that popular book, "The Gates Ajar;" only that here the social aspect has more prominence than the intellectual. The heaven of Miss Phelps differs so little from earth, that even the jokes of this world are transferred to the next

The realistic view embodies much that is true. It is a fundamental principle, underlying the parables and pervading the entire Bible, that the same laws of life and the same types of life run through all the spheres of existence in ever higher forms as we ascend (Heb. viii. 5; ix. 23; Rev. xi. 19). There is thus a unity in the life of creation; creation is but the unfolding of one idea in a variety of stages, each of which is typical and prophetical of those lying above it, and exhibits the idea more clearly and perfectly the nearer we approach the goal of the development. Now the realistic view rests upon one side of this incontestable principle—on the unity of law and type; and however defective it may appear from another point of view, it undeniably contains important elements of truth. It appeals to the Bible for its proof; it claims Scriptural imagery as its witness; it calls forth the sympathies of the human heart, because it pictures heaven as something real and tangible, upon which the mind can fasten as it cannot on impalpable shadows. Indeed, whenever the veil is lifted by inspiration and we are permitted to catch a glimpse of that glorious home, there is revealed to the gaze, not a misty region where all is dim, and attenuated, and uninviting to mortal eye, but a home that has all the warm and sensible accompaniments which give such an expression of strength and life and coloring to our present abode. Heaven is painted by God's word in such vivid hues of reality, that we at once feel at home amid scenery where there is a city with its walls and streets, a temple with its worship, fountains with their streams, and trees with their fruits. These, it may be said, are images, and doubtless they are; but they are the images of something real, visible and tangible, corresponding to

realities with which we are familiar on earth. It is not to be supposed that our minds, accustomed to terrestrial scenery, will "at death be abruptly and violently transferred into scenes to which, in their constitution and previous habits of acting, they are entirely unused." Without a figure of speech, heaven is plainly set forth as a definite locality. "I go to prepare a place for you" (John xiv. 2). It is the abode of the Incarnate Redeemer and His embodied saints, who, if they are not to float eternally in an invisible, impalpable, etherial medium, require a local platform, a physical basis, a material heaven, where, retaining all the lineaments of that individuality, corporeal and spiritual, which distinguished them each from the other on earth, they may lead a life of holy fellowship and love, in which thought, feeling and will are exercised in their highest and most perfect form.

While, then, we readily concede that the realistic view springs from the worthy desire of representing heaven, not as a dead abstraction, but as a living reality, and that it embodies a most valuable truth, which it rightly emphasizes in opposition to a bald spiritualism, according to which all concrete, individual, actual life fades away beyond the grave into something dim, shadowy, dreamlike; yet we must not at the same time close our eyes to the fact that it is partial and defective, since it exhibits heaven only under one aspect, and fails to perceive other aspects that are no less essential. Its vitiating error is an ignoring of the difference between the prototype and its copy. It fashions the heavenly after the image of the earthly, instead of fashioning the earthly after the image of the heavenly. The world of glory has no reality for it, except as it reflects earthly forms and earthly relations. But Paradise, however beautiful a type of heaven, was not yet heaven. Though man was pure and unsullied, and nature was clothed with a robe of festal splendor, yet there was a broad chasm between the bright habitation of Jehovah and the peaceful Eden of our first parents. The difference was not so much local as dynamical. Man and earth were awaiting a renewal, a metamorphosis, a glorification which, apart from sin, is necessary for creation, if it is to enter

upon the final stage of its development. Of this wondrous transformation the realistic view knows nothing, because it is ignorant of the Divine teleology. "Beginning and result," says Martensen, "reality and idea, are not coincident in time; on the contrary, they are *outside* of each other. It is in this *outward* relation between the teleological momenta, and in the successive movements through which they are brought to form an inner unity, that time has its existence. As teleological time has had a beginning, so must it also have an end. For the goal of the development must finally be reached, and that which is fragmentary must be done away with by what is perfect. Time, too, owing as it does its existence to the antithesis and discord between the finite and the infinite, between the ideal and the real, between the variety of life and its unity, must also ultimately be absorbed into *eternity*, that is, into the complete unity of the finite and the infinite, into the undivided fullness of life."* Unacquainted with this fundamental truth, the realistic view implied what Dick expressly says, that the condition of Adam when in a state of innocence "was precisely similar to the state of good men in a future world." It cannot understand that the spirits of just men are *made perfect* that is, brought to their goal, τετελειωμενοι (Heb. xii. 23); else how could it maintain, as it invariably does, that the heavenly life is a *progressus in infinitum*, a restless striving after an absolutely unattainable perfection? Blinded by the unity of life, it is unable to perceive the differences which characterize its several stages, and, above all, it fails to comprehend that heaven is the last, highest stage, and that it takes up all earthly types and laws, and glorifies them in the light of its spiritual life.

That aspect of truth which is overlooked, or, at least, greatly obscured, by the realistic view has undue prominence in the *idealistic view*, which contemplates heaven with almost exclusive attention on that side of its general life, which transcends the empirical realities of earth. Heaven is nothing for it, if it is

* Christian Dogmatics, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, p. 122.

not something altogether new. The realistic view sees the living unity that binds together the heavenly and the earthly, but takes no notice of the wide contrast and unreconciled antithesis; the idealistic has an eye for the features of difference, but none for the points of connection and resemblance. The former converts earth into heaven by simply eliminating sin and destroying death; the latter finds no hope of a heaven save in the utter annihilation of earth. The one makes the future heaven altogether too similar to the present earth; the other unjustifiably separates them by an impassable gulf. Heaven, according to the idealistic view, is an immaterial, invisible sphere of glory, where God and the holy angels and redeemed spirits eternally dwell. It is the ideal world of life, light and love,—of life, manifesting itself in the form of light and energizing in the form of love. The question of locality has here little or no significance. Often, indeed, there is not even a thought of a definite place; there is only the thought of an overwhelming glory and an unutterable joy. And when at times the idealist feels that heaven must be a habitation in space as well as a life in the spirit, he vaguely represents it, now, as encompassing us like an invisible presence, and again, as lying above the stars, and indeed, beyond the flaming walls of creation. While the realistic view, which is apt to assume a materialistic shape, regards heaven as primarily a place and cannot conceive of it, as stript of all vestiges of materiality; the idealistic view, no less prone to assume a spiritualistic form, sees it prevailingly in the light of a state, and looks with coolest indifference on its relations to matter and space. The realist demands that heaven shall afford beautiful scenery for the eye and regale the ear with melodious sounds; but grant the idealist his angelic life in God, and he has all the heaven he asks or craves. The one conception does not really reach beyond a purified, yet unrejuvenated earth; the other extends as far as the intermediate state, but sees no meaning in the resurrection of the body and the glorification of the world. Neither the one nor the other is a full, adequate conception of our home and life beyond the grave.

By heaven Schœberlein understands God's omnipresence. It is not, he says, "locally out of, or above the earth, but embraces and penetrates the entire terrestrial world, although not locally: it is the living foundation by which the earthly space is supported."* This, Ebrard justly remarks, may be the heaven of speculation, but it is not the heaven of the Bible, according to which God is present, not only in heaven, but also on earth, omnipresent in all the universe, although His presence in the one sphere is more intensive than in the other, for heaven is His throne, earth only His footstool. While there are few, however, who would advocate a view so extremely transcendental, there are many who say, that heaven is merely a state of being, and that its locality, if it can be said to have locality, is here, there, wherever there is a holy soul. This spiritualistic notion first gained admission into Protestant theology about the beginning of the seventeenth century through the influence of the celebrated John Gerhard, who maintains that the old heavens and the old earth will at the judgment be completely destroyed. The new heaven and the new earth, Paradise, the Father's house, the Temple of God, the heavenly Jerusalem—these are only figurative designations of the *Where* of the Blessed, of whose mode, quality and basis we can form no proper conception. It is puerile, he thinks, to regard heaven as a place, since it is not corporeal, but spiritual; and what the Scriptures describe as a place is, in his opinion, nothing more than a state. The emancipation of the creature is not by renewal, but by annihilation. Indeed, the later theologians, almost without exception, taught the complete destruction of the world in its very substance, until at last rationalism resolved the entire conception of a new heaven and a new earth into the symbol of a sphere of activity fitted for the spirit when freed from all earthly limitations.† Nor can it be doubted that this false spiritualism, which sees a diametric opposition between the region of sense and the region of spirituality, has ever since held, and even now holds, a prominent place in the Chris-

* See Ebrard's Christliche Dogmatik, Vol. 2, p. 241.

† Tod, Fortleben und Auferstehung, von Franz Spittgerber, see note, p. 235.

tian mind. It is found especially in books of practical religion, where such endless, wearisome changes are rung upon a few vague, yet high-sounding phrases, which, assuming the place of substance and reality, neither awaken belief nor give satisfaction, that we feel no surprise at Madame De Gasparin's exclamation: "Splendor! Immensity! Eternity! Grand words! Great things! A little definite happiness would be more to the purpose."

The idealistic view, like the realistic, is based upon a truth which it emphasizes, however, at the expense of other truths. It rests upon the second-half of that principle running through God's universe, according to which the types of life, notwithstanding their inner unity, are developed through a variety of ascending stages and assume a diversity of forms as they rise in the scale of creation. It denies that there is only one æon of man, and it points to the analogy of nature to prove that a particular creature may undergo a very extraordinary change of form, and may appear and reappear in quite distinct modes of being. The snake casts off its old slough and glides forth renewed; the beetle, when it commences its summer-work, breaks from its filthy sepulchre; and the spring, bringing resurrection from the grave of winter, infuses new vitality into every living thing and clothes the earth with a marvelous beauty. Facts like these are full of significance for the advocate of the idealistic view. "Some traveler or poet tells him fabulous tales of a bird, which, grown aged, fills its nest with spices, and, spontaneously burning, soars from the aromatic fire, rejuvenescent for a thousand years, and he cannot but take the phœnix for a miraculous type of his own soul springing, free and eternal from the ashes of his corpse. Having watched the silk-worm, as it wove its cocoon and lay down in its oblong grave apparently dead, until at length it struggles forth, glittering with rainbow-colors, a winged moth, endowed with new faculties and living a new life in a new sphere, he conceives that so the human soul may, in the fullness of time, disentangle itself from the imprisoning meshes of this world of sorrows, a thing of spirit-beauty, to sail through heavenly airs; and hence-

forth he engraves a butterfly on the tombstone in vivid prophecy of immortality."* But significant as these analogies are, it is not on them alone that this view relies for confirmation of its truth. It makes a direct appeal to the Scriptures, which manifestly place heaven and earth, the life above and the life below, in the most marked antithesis, revealing the former as a sphere in which there reigns such a purity, holiness and harmony of life, that, in comparison with it, our existence in the flesh is but darkness and death; such a fullness, strength, glory and blessedness of life, that earth appears in contrast as the abode of pitiable poverty and miserable weakness. Thus the redeemed attain to the "resurrection of life" (John v. 29), "inherit everlasting life" (John xix. 29), "eat of the tree of life" (Rev. xxii. 2), drink of "the river of the water of life" (Rev. xxii. 1), and have their brows encircled with "the crown of life" (Rev. ii. 10). In like manner, heaven is described as a Kingdom of light, where God, who is light (1 John i. 5), and the Father of lights (James i. 17), "dwelleth in light which no man can approach unto" (1 Tim. vi. 16); where the ransomed of earth enter upon "the inheritance of the saints of light" (Col. i. 12); where there is no need of the sun or moon, since the celestial city is illuminated by the glory of God, and the Lamb is the light of it (Rev. xxi. 23); and where the righteous shine forth as the sun (Matt. xiii. 43), as at the transfiguration Christ's face "did shine as the sun and His raiment was white as the light" (Matt. xvii. 2). It is a realm of glory. The risen Redeemer at His ascension was received up into glory (1 Tim. iii. 16), and now sitteth on the throne of His glory (Matt. xxv. 31). The redeemed are called unto eternal glory (1 Pet. v. 10), and, when they shall be presented "faultless before the presence of God's glory" (Jude 24), will receive a crown of glory (1 Pet. v. 4). Indeed the entire difference between heaven and earth is summed up in that one very expressive, but much misunderstood word, *glory*. The condition of the Blessed, according to the Bible, is specifically unlike the condition of men in

* Alger's History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, p. 39.

the flesh. Their bodies are spiritual, (1 Cor. xv.), and their spirits have mounted to the plane of perfection where faith gives place to hope, and vision, to fruition, and where knowledge, no longer partial and fragmentary, is a knowing even as we are known (1 Cor. xiii). The children of the resurrection are equal to the angels, (Luke xx. 36), and have entered upon a state the full glory of which no tongue can utter, no imagination can conceive. Enveloped as we are by the mists of earth, we can only say, in the language of John: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." (1 John iii. 2).

Still, the idealistic view, though it exhibits many features of the truth, is one-sided and defective. It paints heaven in such purely spiritual colors, that when we contemplate the picture we feel instinctively that we should be as strangers amid its scenes, and that a sense of loneliness and isolation would steal over the mind far more keen than that experienced by travelers in a foreign land, where new and unfamiliar objects meet the eye, and barbarous, unintelligible sounds strike the ear. Accustomed to the solid, material realities of earth, we should need a violent adjustment to the shadowy surroundings of our eternal home. It is true,—and this is a truth on which the idealistic view justly lays stress—that our life in heaven will not be of the same order as our life on earth, since it will be freed from the conditions and limitations which attach to our present existence. The experience of the new life will differ widely from the experience of the old; but it will not stand in contradiction to man's essential, eternal being. When man shall cast off his earthly conditionality and enter upon the higher life of the spirit, he will not become a disembodied spirit, having no relation to the material world, for that would involve the destruction of his constitution as it now stands. "The soul is constitutionally interwoven with an external world through all its mundane history. The mind or spirit develops itself in this connection, and in its very texture it is intertwined with the forms of time and space. It rests, if not necessarily,—

though this, I think, not however in a materialistic sense, might be confidently affirmed—yet by a powerful habit upon matter; and this habit has not been an individual state, but it has been the only state of existence with which the soul was acquainted from the first dawn of its consciousness. To tear the spirit suddenly loose at death from these relations to an external world, and place it in a state completely and forever isolated from all matter, where it would find no opportunity to exercise these faculties, would be subjecting it to a terrible violence,—a violence which would destroy its own personal identity."* According to the Biblical conception of the world, the life of nature forms the basis on which rests the life of the spirit, by which it is to be ever more and more imbued and ennobled. This is the meaning of the Christian doctrines of the glorified body, and the transformation of the world, to which the idealistic view of heaven can not give full significance. That view, indeed, springs, consciously or unconsciously, from a false dualism which, splitting creation into halves, places the world of mind in an attitude of antagonism to the world of matter, and regards the ideal as something spectral and without corporeal form. It knows only of an inward heaven in the perfected spirit, which comes to no manifestation, however, in an outward heaven in a glorified nature. It would seem to imply, even when it does not expressly assert, that the grossness of materiality is only for creatures who have sunk into the grossness of sin; and that the soul, when it shall have been cleansed from moral evil and released from its imprisoning flesh, will mount up to some shadowy region, where not only sin and death, but also matter and sense with everything in the shape of audible sound and tangible substance, will be forever unknown. Were this view true, however, it would be hard to understand why the human spirit, when yet unstained with evil, was incorporated in a material body and placed on this solid material earth. "But, certain it is, that man, at the first, had for his place this world, and, at the same time, for his privilege, an unclouded

* Harbaugh's Sainted Dead, (p. 31).

fellowship with God, and, for his prospect, an immortality which death was neither to interrupt nor put an end to. He was terrestrial in respect to condition, and yet celestial in respect both of character and enjoyment. His eye looked outwardly on a landscape of earth, while his heart beat upwardly in the love of heaven. And though he trod the solid platform of our world, and was compassed about with its horizon—still was he within the circle of God's favored creation, and took his place among the freemen and the denizens of the great spiritual commonwealth."* And it is no less certain that the redeemed soul, after having been freed by death from the burden of its material vesture, will at the resurrection be re-embodied. "The fact of the resurrection proves that, with man at least, the state of a disembodied spirit, is a state of unnatural violence, and that the resurrection of his body is an essential step to the highest perfection of which he is susceptible." And if the Bible does not err, when it foretells, not the annihilation, but the transformation and glorification of the material world, we may be sure that, instead of being carried to some dim, spectral abode, remote from all human experience and beyond all human comprehension, we shall walk forever in a land filled with sensible delights, and resplendent with sensible glories, with which, doubtless, the new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, will be profusely strewn.

From this rapid survey of the two conceptions of heaven, the realistic and the idealistic, it will at once be seen that each is a partial exhibition of the truth, vitiated at the same time by a large admixture of error. In the one, heaven wears an aspect of superterrestrial spirituality; in the other, of real, visible, tangible corporeity. The Biblical conception, eliminating what is false in each, and combining what is true, sets forth the higher living unity of this contrast, both sides of which, maintained in all their definiteness, are reconciled with each other by the mediating truth of the glorification.

What then, we ask again, is the Christian heaven? It is *the*

---

* Chalmers' Sermon on the New Heavens and the New Earth.

sphere of God's self-revelation,—a realm of creation where the Creator manifests, to the creature and in the creature, all the riches of His infinite life. He is present, it is true, in every part of His dominions (Ps. cxxxix.); but in heaven He is present in a special, intensive sense. While earth is only His footstool, heaven is His temple, His habitation, His holy place (Ps. ii. 4; 2 Sam. xxii. 7; Rev. vii. 15; Heb. ix. 24; Is. lxvi. 1). The Scriptures frequently refer to a particular spot in the universe which they term *the throne of God*. "A glorious high throne from the beginning is the place of Thy sanctuary." It is the concentrated expression of His majesty and glory, where, in the presence of the sinless hosts, He unveils all sides of His being, as He unveils them nowhere else; for on earth, before sinful man, He manifests only single sides of His life, and that, not in immeasurable fullness. Before creation, God dwelt in His uncreated heaven, which is the infinite, eternal, immaterial manifestation of His divine nature, and which the Bible calls *His glory*. And though this glory belongs not to the essence of God, but is only the effulgence of His nature, yet it may be regarded as the vesture with which he robes Himself, according to the declaration of the Psalmist: "Thou art clothed with majesty and honor; Thou coverest Thyself with *light*, as with a garment;" with which agrees also the declaration of the Apostle, that God "dwelleth in *light*, which no man can approach unto." But, moved by the impulses of a boundless love, God would not confine His activity within the circle of His own being. Though self-derived, and, therefore, self-sufficient, needing nothing from without to complete His blessedness, He determined to reveal Himself externally in a created sphere, to fill it with His life, and to make it the abode of His glory. That sphere where He is absolutely revealed in all the fullness of His being, is heaven.

In the other provinces of creation, there is, indeed, a general manifestation of God. "For," says Paul, who, on this account, regards the heathen as without excuse, "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, —*Θειότης*, divinity, the sum of His attributes, such as majesty,

power, wisdom, goodness; not *Θεότης*, Deity, the Divine Being, Himself, who created the world and dwelt in Christ (Rom. i. 20.) Even impersonal nature with its multitudinous voices, sounding out from earth and air and sky, displays some of His attributes, showing forth in a very striking manner His marvelous wisdom and His adorable goodness. The world of mind discloses still higher attributes. We see His holiness in the human conscience, and His justice and mercy in human history. But this general exhibition of single aspects of God's life falls far short of revelation, in the proper sense of the word. That part of the created universe which lies beyond the confines of heaven may serve to give us a glimpse of God, by reflecting a few scattered rays of His glory; but it does not unveil His essential being, and is not, therefore, the sphere of His full, perfect, personal revelation. For revelation, in its highest, absolute form, is God's communication of Himself to the creature—a communication in which He fills out the whole compass of the creature with His holy life and suffuses it with His glorious light—in which He takes up His everlasting abode in the world, making it, not simply the symbol of His thoughts, but the very shrine and sacrament of His most real, substantial presence. Far from merely imparting the ideas of the Divine Mind, whether through the inarticulate utterances of nature, or through the more perfect medium of human speech, revelation communicates God Himself in the totality of His being, who thus finds for His uncreated nature a living habitation in a created nature, and makes it the organ of His perfect manifestation. In short, revelation, if it is to be living and complete, is inseparable from the idea of an incarnation of God in the world. It reaches its final, absolute form, therefore, in the person of the God-man, Jesus Christ (Heb. i. 1–4). God was manifest in Christ, in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, who is the image of the invisible God, the beaming image of His glory and the impress of His substance; and who, on this account, is more than a mere ray of the Divine Majesty, inadequately revealing some part or single side of the Divine nature. The humanity of Christ is the living temple of God, in which He

finds a dwelling-place in the world, and from which, as a center, He designs to fill creation with His life and glory. Accordingly, the Incarnate Son is the inmost heart of heaven. In him all things consist; "for it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven" (Col. i. 19, 26). Even while on earth, He was the mighty center from which the powers and forces of heaven, lodged in His divine humanity, streamed out into the world; in His person heaven was disclosed, the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man (John i. 51). But since earth, as the seat of the curse, is not an adequate sphere for the full manifestation of His infinite glory, Christ, after entering upon the life of the Spirit in the resurrection, ascended to another and a loftier sphere, in which the Father had already given the highest expression of His majesty and power, and which, corresponding in its external features to the inner glory of the Incarnate Son, is to be considered as, in the language of Lange, "the ethereal realization of the ideas of His life, and as the ideal antitype of the transformed world which He will bring into existence upon earth." Here, as the exalted Prince and living center of a kingdom of love, He reveals Himself in undimmed splendor as the perfect brightness of God; and, in revealing Himself He reveals God, since He is "the fullness of the revelation of God comprised in one definite person." As God fills Him without measure, so, through Him, does He here fill the creature according to the measure of its capacity; and as Christ is divine, no less than human, so through Him, is the creature made partaker of the divine nature (2 Peter i. 4). Here first we have the perfect fulfillment of the Apostle's prayer, that the saints may be "filled with all the fullness of God" (Eph. iii. 19), for here God is "all and in all" (1 Cor. xv. 28), not merely exhibiting single attributes of His nature, but communicating His essential, substantial being to the creature who sees Him as He is, mirrors His

image, reflects His light, bathes in His love and shows forth His glory.

But since the revelation of which heaven is the sphere is a living revelation, which, while conveying a knowledge of God, at the same time imparts the divine nature, it is evident that it can be a communication only to the created spirit. For God is spirit; and if His revelation is an impartation of Himself, impersonal nature, which has nothing akin to Him, is incapable of being its organ. Only the personal spirit made in the divine image can become the temple in which the living God unveils His essence and finds a permanent abode. Indeed, only the perfected personal spirit is able to serve as the medium of God's absolute self-revelation, since it alone has full capacity for receiving into itself the divine and becoming the organ of God. When we say, therefore, that heaven is the sphere of God's perfect revelation of Himself, we at once imply that it is *the sphere of the perfected spirit.* The life of the spirit, unlike the life of nature, does not repeat itself in uniform and constantly recurring cycles. The giant oak, originating from an acorn of whose latent possibility it is only the full realization, completes its development by yielding fruit containing new germs, through which it reproduces itself in the same unvarying form. All natural life is such a cyclical movement from germ to germ. But the life of the spirit unfolds itself in a series of stages, rising ever higher and higher, until all its slumbering powers are perfectly developed and brought into full and harmonious play. The movement, though one of progressive development, is not endless, in the sense of a false *progressus in infinitum*, as if the spirit were to be forever struggling toward an ever-receding limit which it can by no possibility reach, even in an unending eternity. It has a goal; but that goal must be attainable if the design of creation is ever to be accomplished. There is a difference between promise and fulfillment; but will not the promise lying in the spirit once be fulfilled? Shall we deny the divine teleology, which proposes a definite end, toward which it moves with an apparently slow, but with a sure and steady step? "As the Mosaic narrative

teaches us that the natural universe was completed in a series of days of creation, that is, epochs of time, so too must we say that the kingdom of freedom is brought into existence in a like series of days of creation. No sooner does one epoch in the history of the world come to an end, than a new creative day dawns—the words 'let there be light' are spoken anew by the divine creative word. But as the natural creation attained its consummation and rest in man, so also does the spiritual creation move onward through a series of creative days or epochs, to that eternal rest or Sabbath which has significance not merely for creation, but also for the Creator."*

The earthly stage of our existence is characterized by a severe struggle toward an ideal, which, never attained on this side of the grave, is fully realized in heaven, the realm of spiritual perfection. There, the created spirit, whether human or angelic, becomes actually what from the first it was potentially—the image of God. "As for me," says the psalmist, "I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness" (Ps. xvii. 15). There the limit of development is reached, and the spirit enters into the last, highest form of its life. "The supposition that this terrestrial life, which here we live, is the only one possible to us, that a state of perfect bliss is inconceivable, because life is made up only of repeated endeavors towards the goal—this supposition misjudges that in a state of bliss the goal has been reached, as well as shall ever anew be reached, that the blessed life *is* as well as shall be. So far from life being done when this portion of it is accomplished, we should rather say that life is only now so far advanced that it may truly be said to *begin*, all this temporal and partial work, all the commotions and agitations of history, and the long conflict of the Church on earth, prepares only for this beginning; because herein the creation of man is only now at length fully accomplished. This beginning, being the beginning of an endless life of bliss, is the beginning of a (true) *progressus in infinitum;* of an advance εἰς τοὺς

* Martensen's Dogmatics, p. 122.

αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. But this life of bliss is the centralization of human progress; time is no more this historical time with its cuttings to waste, its losses and its imperfect works; but the fullness of eternity now streams through the course of ages, so that an entire eternity is contained in every moment of time." *

Heaven, then, is the sphere of a new order of life, of the perfected life of the spirit, which, in accordance with its glorious destination, finds its eternal home in God, living in God and God living in it, and filling it as a holy vessel with the fullness of His life. Faith, by which we walk on earth, is merged in vision, and the spirit, no longer seeing through a glass darkly, beholds, immediately revealed to its view, the glory of God, which in this life is veiled from the mind by figurative words and obscure symbols. "We shall see Him as He is," even "face to face;" the pure in heart shall see God (1 John iii. 2; 1 Cor. xiii. 12; Matt. v. 8). When the spirit thus reaches the acme of its development, its knowledge will undergo a change of form. Now it is partial and fragmentary, because it is acquired piece-meal, by comparing one object with another, observing their mutual relations, and so, by a process of ratiocination, resolving what is doubtful and obscure in the light of what is certain and clear. Then, according to Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 12), we shall thoroughly know (*ἐπιγνώσομαι*) even as we were thoroughly known (*επιγνώφθην*). Knowledge, not requiring laborious search, will be total and central, and will not be attained, as in this imperfect state, by viewing successively single aspects of its objects. The mind will see things *as*, not *because*, they are connected; as a man (to borrow a pertinent illustration from Howe), situated on an eminence, may possibly see, at one view, all the successive parts of a gliding stream; while another, sitting by the water's side, and not changing his place, sees the same parts only because they succeed, those that pass making way for those that follow, to come under his eye. The mind, which now looks from the periphery of things to their center, will in the state of glory, occupy a new, central

* Martensen's Dogmatics, p. 485.

point of view in God, and see all things in God and God in all things. In other words, all knowledge will become theosophy. Hope will be perfected in fruition and desire absorbed in joy; for the spirit, inheriting all in God, will find in Him eternal rest. "There remaineth, therefore, a rest unto the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9)—a *sabbatism*, a Sabbath festive celebration, which, instead of being a round of empty adoration or fruitless contemplation of God, will be characterized by the most energetic activity possible within the limits of creaturely organization, a restful activity or an active repose, accompanied by the highest satisfaction and delight. And the strongest impulse of the spirit will be a boundless, holy love, in which, surrendering itself to God, the spirit is glorified and perfected in Him, enshrining His image and reflecting His light.

Spirit, however, has its basis in nature. That is a false dualism, which, actuated by fear of materialism, thinks it necessary to hold the two factors of the world's life apart, or at all events, to allow them to unite only in an external and mechanical way. The dynamical view which underlies the Bible and alone explains physico-psychical phenomena, regards the life of the spirit as one with the life of nature. Not as though nature, by its inherent powers, could develop itself into spirit. Indeed, a lower stage of nature cannot surmount its own limits and pass over into the next higher—the vegetable kingdom, for example, into the animal kingdom—except as it is met by a new creative beginning, an entirely new principle coming into it from above. And if it is true of the several stages of nature that they are not casually derived one from the other, but postulate in each case a new beginning, how much more true is it that nature with its necessary laws and blind forces cannot generate self-conscious and self-determining spirit! At the same time, it struggles up through its entire development toward the light and freedom of the spirit, for whose advent it prepares the way and in whose complemental presence it attains its ideality. Nature is for spirit, typically foreshadowing it and really mediating its entrance into the world; and it is the task of the spirit to lift nature, in which it stands rooted, up into

its consciousness, to penetrate it with its higher life, and so to ennoble and exalt it to be the adequate medium of its self-manifestation. Nature, accordingly shares the destiny of the spirit with whose life it is thus organically one; a fall in the spiritual world involving a fall in the natural world, and an exaltation of the spirit involving an exaltation of nature (Rom. viii. 18–24). It is necessary, therefore, to define heaven still more closely, as *that sphere of creation where nature, both as joined immediately to the spirit in the form of body, and as surrounding the spirit in the form of external nature, is elevated and glorified so as to become the perfect organ of the spirit, as the spirit is the perfect organ of God.*

What are we to understand by the *glorified nature*, of which heaven is the sphere? Let *Lange* answer the question: "The word glorification has often been employed in an obscure sense. The glorified body has often been represented as a corporeity surrounded by an effulgence of light, without any very clear idea being formed of it. But the effulgence which surrounded the Lord at His first glorification, was only the foretoken, the prophetic blossom, of His coming essential glorification. We do not read that an outward effulgence of light surrounded the risen Lord, and yet His glorification was then completed. Glorification is the raising up of life into the being of the spirit. The glorified man is one in whom the spirit rules, whose corporeity has become entirely spirit, *whose spirit has fully attained to the power of corporeity.* Hence follows that the idea of glorification removes the contrast between both worlds. The glorified man belongs to a new and higher world, which stands above the world on this side and the world beyond the grave, as synthesis does above thesis and antithesis. and which is thus the living union and fulfilment of both."* Such a glorification is included in the positive Christian conception of immortality and is consequently attained in the person of the Risen Redeemer, who is the resurrection and the life, and the principle of the transformation of the world. When He came forth from the grave, it was to enter upon a new, superterrestrial order of life,

* Lange's Life of Christ, vol. v. p. 130.

the peculiarity of which consists, not in laying aside His corporeal nature—for by showing the marks of His wounds, by partaking of food and by permitting His disciples to touch His hands and His feet, he gave the most indubitable proof of having a true body of flesh and blood—but the peculiarity lies in this: that He elevated His corporeal nature to the plane of spirituality, freed it from the conditions and needs of earthly existence, and transformed it into the perfect expression, organ and power of His inner life. And a like glorification awaits, according to the Scriptural promise, all the members of Christ, who will change their vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto His glorious body (Phil. iii. 21). When the Divine life implanted in the soul of the believer by baptism, shall have fully unfolded itself through the operation of the Holy Ghost in the process of sanctification, taking possession of his entire personality, delivering it from selfishness and sin, and perfectly assimilating it to the Divine image, then, since corporeity forms an essential part of the ideal of man, there will naturally and necessarily follow, at the completion of this spiritual process, a new material organism, which, corresponding to the glorified body of the Second Adam, shall be a fitting habitation for the redeemed and perfected spirit, (1 Cor. xv. 42–44; 2 Cor. v. 1). Even on earth, man may approximate in a high degree to the ideal glorified life. His material frame may be so penetrated by his inward spiritual life, that, notwithstanding the deforming power of sin, it becomes highly refined and spiritualized—a bright manifestation of a heavenly light, which irradiates his every feature and seems to surround him with a halo of beauty, not of earth. Who has not seen the difference in these respects between a rude and vicious man in whom the spiritual is repressed or darkened, and a divinely consecrated man who lives in communion with God and breathes the atmosphere of heaven? This, however, is only a prophecy; but it is a prophecy which will be fulfilled in heaven, where spirituality and corporeity will so fully interpenetrate, that the light of the spirit will shine through and beautify the corporeal nature, and the corporeal nature will be in perfect harmony and correspondence with the life of the spirit.

It is evident, however, from the relation of man to nature, that the glorification of the human body is to be expected, not apart from, but in conjunction with, the glorification of the whole natural world, since man, though the head of nature, is yet a member of its organism, and it belongs to the very idea of an organism that its several members are mutually means and ends. The perfection of the head conditions the perfection of the whole body, and, conversely, the perfection of the body conditions the perfection of the head. But the one is not without the other. Scripture, in conformity with the profoundest philosophical truth, assigns the resurrection of man to the last day, when at the same time universal nature shall be transformed, and the old heavens and the old earth shall give place to the new heavens and the new earth. The necessity of this transformation is inherent in the nature of created life, which only attains to the full perfection of its ideality at the close of its development; and the Bible, accordingly, ascribes this necessity, even apart from sin, to the whole universe, to the heavenly regions themselves (Ps. cii. 26, 28; Is. li. 6; Rev. xxi. 5); distinguishing, however, between the regions of glory, which have been renewed, and those regions which, like the earth, must yet be renewed by passing through corruption and the destruction of the world (2 Pet. iii. 10, 23). Heaven is the realm of completed existence, in contrast to those realms which await their final metamorphosis; it is the sphere of glorified corporeity, both in the individual form of the human body, and in the general form of external nature.

The conception of heaven we have now unfolded, is both positive and negative. Viewed on its negative side, it necessarily excludes the presence of sin and all its effects; for, since sin is, in its essential nature, a destructive, disorganizing, disintegrating principle, it can find no entrance into the realm of spiritual perfection. Heaven is the sphere of spotless purity, of absolute holiness,—the direct antithesis of earth, where, beyond the pale of redemption, darkness, misery and death maintains unbroken sway. And there can be no transition, therefore, from earth to heaven except by the utter eradication, the

total annihilation of moral evil. Heaven, while it is indeed a place, must yet be regarded primarily as a state; or rather, it is a spiritual state that realizes itself in a definite outward locality. Simply to be admitted, irrespective of personal character, within its bright precincts, is not yet to be admitted into heaven. Salvation is not an external translation from one spot in the universe to another; it is a moral, spiritual process, which, starting in the regeneration of the individual, completes itself in a physical process,—in the resurrection and glorification of the body; and this involves the necessity of a local heaven, of an external physical sphere, in harmony and correspondence with the completed individual life. God's requirement of holiness, then, as the condition of final salvation, is not arbitrary. We may say, rather, that it is the holiness of heaven which constitutes the fontal source of its happiness. Heaven would not be heaven, the world of perfected spirit, if there could in anywise enter into it anything that defileth, or worketh abomination, or maketh a lie (Rev. xxi. 27).

The true conception of heaven, however, excludes not merely the actual, but also the *possible* presence of sin. It is not enough to assert that its holy inhabitants do not sin; it is necessary at the same time to assert that they cannot sin. The very possibility of moral evil is cancelled, since heaven, as the sphere of absolute spiritual perfection, is the sphere of the identity of freedom and necessity. "If the moral law, as God's will to man, is to be realized by him in a free obedience, the possibility of doing otherwise seems to be necessarily implied in this freedom to obey. This power of doing differently is described in relation to the unconditioned rule or law of the will as the *possibility of evil.* The very fact that there is such an unconditional rule for the will, obliges us to give the name of freedom exclusively to that which is in harmony therewith; yet the possibility of deviation from it—by which man puts himself at variance both with himself and with God—is included in this freedom, for only thus can harmony with the given rule be really free. But this possibility exists only in order that its realization may be continually prevented by the self-decision

of man, and that thus it may be done away with, even as a possibility. Personal creatures must start from what is relatively undetermined, in order by self-determination and self-decision to put an end to this undeterminateness. The will would not be what, in virtue of its formal freedom it should be, viz: a power of true self-determination, if it could not assert itself in such a manner as to give with unfailing necessity a moral character to each of its acts. The starting point is a freedom which does not yet involve an inner necessity, but the possibility of something else; the goal is the freedom which is identical with necessity." *

But the exclusion from heaven of the possibility and fact of sin involves also the exclusion of all its effects. For physical evil, with its manifold forms of pain, disease and death, is only the dark shadow cast upon the universe by the appalling presence of moral evil. The one is the bitter root which yields the other as its bitter fruit; and the destruction of the root brings with it the destruction of the fruit. Such is the beautiful picture which the Bible everywhere gives of heaven—it is a realm of light and blessedness on which there rests no baleful shadow and from which suffering in its protean shapes is forever banished. "And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." (Rev. xxi. 3, 4).

Many stop, however, with this negative conception and fail to see heaven under its positive aspect. The earthly Paradise, though characterized by the absence of sin and of the curse which sin inflicts, was indeed a type, yet it was *only* a type, of the heavenly Paradise. There, spiritual evolution was only begun, not completed; and nature was not only capable, but stood in imperative need, of an inward as well as outward

* Müller, The Christian Doctrine of Sin. Vol. II. p. 27.

transformation, before it could become the medium of manifestation for the perfected, personal spirit. Heaven is the result of a long course of development. It is the sphere where both spirit and nature, in living, indissoluble union, are exalted to the highest plane of perfection attainable by the creature,—a realm of creation, no longer unfolding, but fully unfolded. In heaven the individual spirit has reached its destination, and become, what it could only by a moral process become, the clear, express image of God, whose hand has now given it the last, finishing touches, bringing out all its features in bold relief and combining them in exact symmetry and fit proportion. The lineaments of individuality, far from being obliterated, will then first appear in their utmost distinctness. Each individual spirit, like a sharply defined crystal, will exhibit the Divine image in one of its infinite phases, and the totality of individual spirits, by their endless diversity of life and harmonious fellowship of love, will form a vast spiritual organism, filled with the plenitude of the Infinite Spirit and illuminated by the glory of God. Nature itself will be lifted up into the spirit and partake of its life. In conformity with its dynamical dependence on man and its organic connection with him as its center and head, it will be elevated with the children of God themselves to the state of glory. The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; but it shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God (Rom. viii. 21–22). "The *εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν* can mean only the sharing in the liberty of God's children by the organic appropriation on their part, and by the equality with the children of God produced by means of the transformation; but it cannot mean an independent state of liberty beside them. Their freedom will consist in its helping to constitute the glory, the spiritual splendor of the manifestation of God's children. As Christ is the manifestation of God's glory, because He is illuminated throughout by God, and the sons of God are the glory of Christ as lights from His light, so will nature be the glory of God's sons as humanized and deified

nature."* By this renewal and metamorphosis, it will realize its ideal and thus attain its highest truth, for it will become what from the first it was intended to be, the perfect expression and adequate organ of the higher life of the spirit. Thus, too, it will participate in the freedom of the spirit, for it will no longer be, what to a large extent in our present stage of existence it is, a rude mass of foreign material, investing the spirit, but not thoroughly penetrated by its life. Materiality will not preponderate over vitality, but will be absorbed by it so as to become vitalized in its inmost constitution and impose no limitations on the free movements of the spirit. And nature, in the unity of its truth and freedom, will become beautiful, for its inner being will now shine forth in full, clear, glorious manifestation. It cannot be otherwise than that it shall put on new forms of beauty and robe itself in festive splendor, fulfilling thus the unconscious prophecy of all earthly art, especially of painting and sculpture, by perfectly realizing that ideal which the one seeks to transfer to the canvass and the other to chisel in the lifeless marble. It was thus the heavenly Jerusalem presented itself to the vision of the Apocalyptic Seer: "And the building of the wall of it was of jasper, and the city was of pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; the fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolite; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, a topaz; the tenth, a chrysoprasus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst. And the twelve gates were pearls, every several gate was of one pearl, and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass" (Rev. xxi. 18–21). This may be, it doubtless is, a picture; but no one can fail to perceive that John borrows all that is most precious on earth to aid him in his description of heaven. And then, to show that it glows with a beauty which is but the perfection of a Divine light beaming full down upon it, he adds:

* Lange's Commentary on Romans, chapter viii.

"And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof" (vv. 22–23).

It must be evident from what has thus far been said, that heaven is *the sphere where all antitheses are reconciled and all contrasts harmonized.* Such antitheses and contrasts are essential to every living movement, since it is only through them that the various momenta appear in their distinctness. But though all development is through diversity, it is yet directed toward a higher unity. Reconciliation, harmony, unity—that is the goal for which the life of the world is striving and which it reaches in heaven. The sharpest antithesis which it is possible to conceive, is that of the infinite Creator and the finite creature—of a holy God and of sinful man; and to bridge over this chasm is the problem of all philosophy and of all religion; philosophy seeking a theoretical solution in the way of thought and religion, a practical solution in the way of life. There is, however, but one solution; it is the person and work of Jesus Christ, in whom the Creator and the creature meet in the embrace of life and love. Through Him, the eternal Mediator, the Creator takes up His abode in the creature, and the creature is brought into union and fellowship with the Creator. The power of this reconciliation, however, comes to its full, outward manifestation only in heaven, but it embraces the inhabitants of all God's universe (Col. i. 15–20). "The dark saying of the Apostle," remarks *Lange*, "concerning this extension of the reconciliation, at all events expresses this truth, that the power of the reconciliation extends to the other world. It works in the spirits which already belong in a general way to the sphere of heaven, but are not yet perfect, and continues to work until they reach perfection, until they become altogether one with Christ, with themselves, and with God. Nay, even the pure spirits, the angels, are drawn into this circle of reconciliation, inasmuch as in Christ, the centre of all union, they are brought into harmony and union with the fallen and

redeemed spirits. This is perfect reconciliation, when all disharmony on earth and in heaven, and between earth and heaven, ceases."*

Heaven, accordingly, is *the last goal of all God's ways.* We should fall far short of the truth if we regarded it simply as a place of rewards, where the righteous shall be recompensed for the privations, the sufferings and the conflicts of earth. It is rather the final result of all God's activities in the world, the consummation of His holy purposes. God is love (1 Jn. iv. 16), and His highest aim in creation is to establish a kingdom of love, consisting of personalities that bear His image and are capable of fellowship with Himself, so that an eternal stream of love may flow out from the heart of God into the heart of the creature, and back again from the heart of the creature into the heart of God. To this the whole movement of the world is directed from the first utterance of the Creative Word. Nature struggles up toward freedom, and freedom attains its realization only in the kingdom of love, in which the Divine ideas reach their fullest, serenest manifestation, and God is all in all, celebrating in the hearts of His children His eternal Sabbath of love, peace and blessedness.

---

* Life of Christ, vol. v. p. 192.

ART. VI. THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY.

BY REV. D. H. RIDDLE, D.D.

THE term *mystery*, as used in Scripture, has a peculiar meaning. It does not so much convey the idea that the thing spoken of is unintelligible, as that it is slowly developed, or gradually communicated. It is applied to three things. 1. "The mystery of God," Rev. x. 7; where it means that plan or purpose of God, formed in the beginning, slowly evolved in the successive cycles of our world's history, and to be consummated, in the days of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound. During this slow evolution, "the faith and patience of the saints" are exercised, and they cry out, "How long! Oh Lord?" 2. "The mystery of Godliness." The manifestations of God in the flesh, purposed in the Eternal Counsels, predicted from the entrance of sin, symbolized with gradually increasing clearness, and after ages of faith, spoke, actualized in the person of Jesus Christ. 3. The term is used once more, in application to something which has the same characteristic features, of slow growth, gradual evolution, and final culmination; "*The Mystery of Iniquity.*"

Of this, it may be said, in general, and at the outset, that like its counterpart, "the mystery of godliness," it has this world of ours for the theatre, and "NOW," our age, this parenthesis in God's Eternity, as the period of its evolution and culmination. As "the mystery of godliness," exhibits "the manifold wisdom of God, ordained before the world," so this exhibits, during its progress, and will especially manifest on its consummation, the cunning of the great antagonist power, the author of sin, "the ruler of the darkness of this world." Dark, at every period, it will be, probably, darkest and mightiest at the end. Gradual in evolution, it will be perfect only in the finale. Throughout, it may be characterized as an aping counterfeit or

caricature of "the wisdom of God in a mystery." Its consummation, we believe, is yet future, as nothing yet seen in past ages or at present, fully comes up to the ideal. How long in the future it will be, no one can dogmatically assert, but it would seem to be the intention of Revelation to assure us that it will symbolize in point of time exact, with "the brightness of the Epiphany" of "the great God, even our Saviour;" and the end of "the mystery of God" "in the dispensation of the fulness of time."

In one sense "the mystery of iniquity," may be said to have begun, when through the agency of Satan, "by one man sin entered into the world" and death by sin, involving not only the race, but also "the whole creation," thereby "made subject to vanity." Back of this; why, when, and how, Satan fell, is an utterly impenetrable and incomprehensible mystery, which no sane man attempts to elucidate. Its first working was fearful; it wrought the ruin of the race, in the apostacy of the Head, in whom "all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned and fell." Here is the might and cunning as well as mystery and iniquity. By one stroke, inflicting a wound which extended through "all the successive cycles of time and generations of men." Although we have reason to hope that many, by faith in the protevangel, were rescued and saved, as we know, assuredly, that Abel and Enoch and Noah were, and that these may have been representatives of unnamed and unnumbered more; yet how mighty was that "mystery" of power, that formed such giants in the earth in depravity, and in the days of Noah made so universal as well as "*great*, the wickedness of man" that it was purged only by the waters of the flood. If the author of evil gloated over the moral wreck in Eden, this must have seemed to him a still grander triumph. Though, again, we may hope that Job and Melchizedec were representatives of piety among the nations till the time of Abraham, yet how mighty and pervading was "the mystery of iniquity" in the forms of idolatry and superstition at that period, when a single person and a single family were selected from the all-surrounding perversions to be the deposi-

tory of the truth, and the line of the coming "mystery of godliness." The worship and doctrine of the true God were guarded by the most explicit prescriptions and the most terrific threatenings, in the Mosaic institute; and when its spiritual significancy, underneath its shadows, was ignored, a line of prophets was raised up to counteract this tendency. Yet such was the power of the spirit of evil, that at the advent of Christ, Judaism was but a rotten carcass and the nominal Church, as represented by the Pharisees, but a whited sepulchre. "The mystery of iniquity" seemed again to culminate when it accomplished, through the treason of Judas and the malice of the Hierarchy, the crucifixion of the Son of God, and the national rejection of the Messiah. In the dark interval between the death and resurrection of Christ, the triumph of the powers of darkness seemed complete. But "the end was not yet." A broad field for these antagonistic forces was yet spread out, and centuries were to elapse before the finale.

The early triumphs of "the mystery of godliness," as "preached unto the Gentiles, and believed in the world," were truly wonderful. At the same rate of progress it seemed that "the mystery of God" would soon be finished. The power of the adversary, in the form of persecution and the baptism of blood, failed to arrest its progress, but in another form, that of adulterous connection with the state and the possession of worldly power and office, it wrought more fatally.

We are distinctly told by the Apostle, that even in his day "the mystery of iniquity, doth already work," but that certain agencies then existing, prevented its speedy development and would continue to do so, till taken out of the way. Moreover, that a state of things, which he denominates "a falling away," or apostacy, then future but indefinitely so, would precede the full revelation of final development of the mystery in the form of "the man of sin, the son of perdition," elsewhere called "that wicked, or the lawless one." This advent, or full revelation, is characterized by inspiration, by these remarkable signs: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is God's and worshiped," all power, Divine and human, "so

that as God he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." He challenges the exclusive prerogatives and honors of Divinity. Again, "whose coming or advent," is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish. And once more, that those who yield themselves to this form of iniquity, shall be penally visited "with strong delusions," so as to "believe the Lie" and the Liar. All will agree, that from the apostolic age, till the present, "the mystery of iniquity" has been operative. There is and can be no satisfactory explanation of this world's affairs, "the mystery of God," on this theatre, without taking into account the Satanic, as well as, human and Divine factors. All along the ages, from the entrance of sin, till now, there has been a "Prince of the power of the air," who has shaped "the course of this world," a "ruler of the darkness of this world," "a spirit," a personal Being, "working in the children of disobedience," whose kingdom is parallel with and antagonistic to the kingdom of God, whose aim is the destruction or perversion of all that is good. The same dark power that attempted to strangle Christianity in the cradle, through the jealousy of Herod, and brought its Author to the cross, through the treachery of Judas and the malice of the Hierarchy, has been "going about as a roaring lion" ever since, endeavoring to overthrow or corrupt "the kingdom of God." We must recognize the working of Satan in all the period of perverted Christianity, as really as in the Dragon of Paganism, and the false prophet.

But the question recurs, have any of these manifestations, heretofore, actualized the portrait drawn by the pen of inspiration? Can we say, that "the man of sin," has been revealed? Does any thing, on the tableaux of history, fully correspond with the revealed characteristics of "that wicked?" In all the assumptions, and presumptions, the "lying wonders and deceivableness of unrighteousness," and "strong delusions" which our fallen humanity has witnessed, has anything yet fully equalled the representations given by the apostle, writing as moved by the Holy Ghost, to whom "a thousand years are

as one day?" Every successive age is prone to exaggerate its own importance in the grand drama, and how many interpretations of prophecy, confidently put forth, have been proved by the event, to be unfounded! The wheels of Providence, in permitting the working of evil and in baffling the designs of the kingdom of darkness, move slowly. He is "patient, because eternal." He allowed four thousand years to roll away, before the manifestation of "the mystery of godliness," and surely we may conclude that the Revelation of the corresponding mystery may be yet future. Though the great agent has put forth already fearful forms of perversion and delusion, there may be yet undeveloped forces brought out in the final conflict, "when his time is short," and he is to be destroyed. Though "the faith and patience of saints" have been exercised all along in consequence of this malign agency, there may be yet severer trials, before the end and "the mystery of God" is finished. While the hosts on either side, have been hitherto under the guidance of their respective leaders, it may be, among the things of the future, that they themselves, in some more palpable form, will appear, when the crushing defeat of one side and the crowning victory of the other, shall come to pass! So, we have read the mystic page, which God has written to cheer His own, amidst the darkening gloom of baffled hopes and long delay.

It is well known that by very many, and in former times almost all, Protestant expositors, these characteristics were supposed to be actualized in the Pope of Rome, as a perpetuated person; that he was and is "the man of sin;" that his assumption of universal, temporal and spiritual power, verified the prophetic delineation; that his supremacy was obtained and is perpetuated by Satanic assistance in the form of miraculous wonders; that all his followers are under the penal influence of "strong delusions," and that we are to look for his overthrow by some Divine interposition, probably, now not far distant. On this scheme of interpretation, imperial Rome was the remora to the full revelation of "the mystery of iniquity" and Papal Rome, the seat of the apostacy. The titles assumed by

the Popes, at different periods, and especially the combination of supreme, secular and sacred prerogatives in one person, are cited in confirmation of this view. If the Pope's claim to official infallibility should be confirmed by the assembled Œcumenical Council, it would be considered as additional evidence of the correctness of this interpretation. Allowing, for the moment, this to be "the mind of the Spirit" in the predicted apostacy; how fearful is the exhibition of power in the system, when three hundred years after the Reformation, such an assemblage comes together at the invitation of the so-called Head of the Church, representatives from the civilized world, and not least significant, from our own country. To those who believe this theory of interpretation, how gigantic must "the mystery of iniquity" appear, and how consolatory the thought, that the era of its full revelation, will be that of its destruction! But even on this interpretation, the end is not yet, possibly "*not by and by.*" Luke xxi. 9.

There are, however, grave difficulties attending this interpretation. Allowing that Antichrist as described by St. John, and "the man of sin" by St. Paul, are but different aspects of the same object, it is hard to find any ground of attributing the inspired characteristics of antichrist to the Papacy. "He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," or Jesus Christ come in the flesh, "is not of God, and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world." Whatever else may be rightly attributed to the Papal scheme, it cannot be said that it has these marks of antichrist. If there is one thing that distinguishes the Romish Church, it is the uniform and constant upholding of the great doctrine of the Incarnation, "confessing Jesus Christ come in the flesh."

While, therefore, we may allow that the perversions of Christianity, in this scheme, have resulted, as the corruptions of the Jewish Church and the sad interruption of the progress of the Reformation, from the workings of this mysterious and mighty power, we are constrained to look for its full develop-

ment and last revelation, as yet future. It has worked, and doth work, and will work. While God intended, that during the cycles of time, "His manifold wisdom should be gradually known to principalities and powers in heavenly places," He seems to have intended, also, that ample scope and verge, should be given to "spiritual wickednesses in high places, the rulers of the darkness of this æon," to manifest themselves and put forth all their resources, before their final overthrow.

It is plain from the tenor of Paul's 2d Epistle to the Thessalonians, that the believers of that day expected the speedy advent of the Lord Jesus and the end of the world. It was to correct this misapprehension and to prepare them and us for the long delay, that the Apostle was inspired to write the Epistle. The same misapprehension, it is well known, has existed at different periods since. The same may be said of the "mystery of iniquity." Good men have seen and identified all the inspired features of the portrait, in their day, and confidently expected its destruction. Staunch old Martin Luther no more doubted that the Pope was "the man of sin" and "antichrist," than he doubted the personality of the Evil one, and he seems to have expected that the Reformation would be the instrument of his destruction, as really as he expected the final triumph of the Son of God. So, the enthusiastic apostles of liberty and equality, at the era of the French Revolution, expected the end of all despotisms, and the speedy recognition and universal enjoyment of "the rights of man," as the result of that mighty earthquake. But the Reformation has existed for centuries, and there is yet no destruction, and the earthquakes of revolution have shaken the civilized world, and its political and social millennium is yet to come.

The last book of the sacred Canon seems to have been constructed with a view of guarding God's people against such hasty conclusions, in regard to "the mystery of God." It is not so much designed to enable us to prophesy of "the times and seasons," as to assure us of the certain final triumph of the Lord and His Christ, "which in His times He will show" and make manifest, and to encourage "the faith and patience of

the saints," in the whole intervening period. While it has served this purpose with humble believers, who have stood in their lot and toiled or suffered under the influence of "that blessed hope," it is worthy of notice how often and completely it has baffled the expectations of those who have studied it, with another purpose. Possibly the Church now, needs the exhortation which the Apostle gave to the Thessalonians, "in reference to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," in its application to "the mystery" and the speedy destruction, that we be "not soon shaken in mind or be troubled, as though its full revelation had either actually come or *is at hand.*" We may fail in our interpretation of the seals and the trumpets and the vials; we may mistake as to Babylon and the dragon and the beast; we may disarrange the magnificent chart of the Divine purposes and unduly magnify the earthquakes of our own period; we may misapprehend as to how soon the last development of this mystery, may take place; but of one thing we are assured, that is, its final overthrow, "in the times before appointed;" of this we are not allowed to doubt. It is settled by the testimony of Revelation. When "the mystery of God is finished," "the mystery of iniquity," also will cease. Thus much is certain: but what new combinations may be formed hereafter, and what elements may enter into the final Revelation, no one can know or ought positively to assert. It would seem, that one feature that will characterize this period, will be great plausibility in the forms of opposition assumed. In this view there is something fearful in the Saviour's expression, "So as to deceive (if it were possible) the very elect." The plain inference is, that none but those who are genuine believers having principled piety, can escape from the delusive power exerted by the final advocates of error. This plausibility or "deceiveableness," may be derived from still more wonderful penetration into the laws and mysteries of nature and control of its hidden agencies, used in support of opposition to the Kingdom of God, indicated by "signs and by wonders."

It would seem, too, that at the full revelation of this mystery, "that wicked," there will be a more direct and personal

agency of the great author of evil, "Evil one," "whose coming" or advent, which the Apostle makes synonymous with his revelation or full manifestation, "is after the working or energy of Satan." There seems to be here, the conception of more direct personal agency; the presence of the leader of the hosts of darkness himself in the final scene. Just as in the delineation in the apocalypse of the final conflict, "the battle of that great day of God Almighty," we have one on a White Horse, followed by the armies of Heaven, appearing as the Personal Leader, so when "the spirit of devils, working miracles," has gone forth unto "the kings of the earth," the powers of evil, to gather them to this battle, which is to be decisive, his marshalled hosts may be headed by himself. This would only be an illustration on a mightier scale, of what often occurs in the campaigns of mortals and the "decisive battles of the world." What are the mightiest battles of earth where the fate of Empires was decided, with "confused noise of the warrior and garments rolled in blood," in comparison with this, where "spiritual wickednesses in high places and the rulers of the darkness of this world," after repeated assaults and partial overthrows, shall make their last combined assault under the direction of the prince of darkness against "the King of kings, and Lord of lords." "The mystery of iniquity," fully revealed; meeting "the mystery of godliness," to be "destroyed by the breath of His mouth" and His glorious epiphany.

"This glorious epiphany" of the Lord, whenever it occurs, is always in holy Scripture, marked with the features of visibility and personality, and though we must not unduly press the words of the Apostle yet "the man of sin" and "that wicked," naturally convey something analogous in the parallel revelation of "the mystery of iniquity." If the grand object of the spirit of evil has ever been to counterfeit and caricature "the mystery of godliness," for the purposes of delusion and perversion, who can tell how successfully, after all his practice, he may assume this appearance in his final strategy? If his servants or agents or "ministers," "false apostles, deceitful workers, tranform themselves into apostles of Christ"—under his tuition, to

do his work, as they have ever done heretofore, we cannot doubt that Satan himself, may be "transformed into an angel of light," when the crisis comes with a plausibility unparalleled in the past.

It is an interesting feature in our times, that the affections and energies of the Church are coming more and more to be concentrated in the vital question of the Person of Christ, "The pillar and ground of the truth," the Citadel of Christianity. There is already and probably will be hereafter still more fearfully a parallel concentration of opposition. "The kings of the earth and the rulers" who all along have set themselves against the Lord and His anointed, a personal Jehovah and an incarnate manifestation, seem to be preparing for another combined assault with the watchword, there is no God, but law; no Revelation but the inspiration of genius; no Gospel but culture; no worship but art. Then, too, while the heart of Christendom is more and more tending towards "that blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ," the cry of the scoffers waxes louder and louder, as the expression of their lusts or wishes, "Where is the promise of His coming?" The machinery will go on forever, as it has in the past. As it had no author, it needs and will have no interposition. When this arrogancy has reached its acme, there is reason to expect, that on both sides the Conqueror and the crushed one, will be more fully revealed. When that which hinders is taken out of the way, and God allows the enemy and his allies to rally and concentrate their last forces; when the cunning and malice, ever increased and developed by ages, is perfected and one spirit animates all the ranks of opposition and the lines are closed up, "Then shall that wicked be revealed," we know not how, "whom the Lord will consume with the Spirit of His mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming."

It would seem, moreover, that the full and final revelation of the mystery of iniquity in the form of "the man of sin—that wicked, the Son of Perdition," will be characterized by an assumption of all sovereignty, human and Divine—"exalting

himself above all that is called God and worshiped"—"sitting in the temple of God and showing himself to be God." We have already suggested the ground of doubt or difficulty, in regard to the usual application of this to the Papacy. But, what in miniature or shadow, has been verified already in that system, may have a gigantic reality in the future. While we cannot say, that to complete the parallel and caricature of the other great mystery, there will be a personal Incarnation of the Evil one, yet there may be *something*, which in opposition to "the true God and His Son Jesus Christ," a combination of previous atheistic and anti-christian elements, will challenge all their prerogatives! When the world has tired of having no God, but Law, and no worship, but of nature, and cried out for something more tangible, the last form of delusion may be, we do not speak dogmatically, something actualizing this part of the inspired portrait. If not a Person, an actual Incarnation, a Satanic humanity; yet an assumption of the prerogatives of Divinity demanding the reverence and adoration of men, under penalty of Death, in an advent caricaturing that of Christ.

As the previous doctrine of the second coming assumes more and more definiteness to the faith and hope of believers, when "the time of the end" approaches; when men are eagerly looking for the signs of His advent, and all else is proving vanity, then, especially this form of delusion may be expected. Then, all but the truly spiritual, who control the spirits and judge all things, and yet cannot be deceived by plausibilities, or lying wonders, will be carried away to be destroyed with these Deceivers, and

"Who shall live, when God doth this?"

Art. VII. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY E. V. GERHART, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MERCERSBURG, PA.

Dogmatic Theology being directly related to Christian consciousness and Christian thinking as obtaining in the bosom of the Church catholic, is to be distinguished, on the one hand, from the general science of Theology, and on the other from the particular science of biblical Theology.

Theology is not necessarily the science of God as revealed in the person and work of Christ. Whilst supernatural revelation certainly conditions that scientific knowledge of God which as to substance and form is true in the full sense of the term, and fully satisfies the profoundest needs of the human reason, yet so far from definitely circumscribing all true knowledge of God by its own law and confining it within the sphere of the new creation, revelation proceeds on the assumption that, notwithstanding the fall and its far-reaching consequences, there is still at hand in the spirit of corrupt humanity both an intuition and a cognition of God, that, as to essence, is true and valid. That God is, that men must acknowledge and worship Him, that mankind is in a state of misery and needs propitiation and deliverance, that there is a state of existence beyond the grave, that hereafter the souls of men will be happy or miserable, and many other truths projected by the human spirit yearning after the favor and fellowship of God, are intuitive beliefs that have in every age prevailed among all the civilized, and almost without exception also among all the barbarous and even savage nations of the world. These ideas being intuitive and necessary, and therefore an integral element of human consciousness, they direct and give character to thought and reflection. They operate as an internal plastic force. Among all nations, civilized and barbarous, there have conse-

quently been forms of faith concerning the Divine and divine activities, or myths; myths covering the whole sphere and all the relations of human life.

And among all civilized nations there has been profound reflection and logical thinking, or philosophy; that is to say, a continuous effort of the reason to penetrate the truth underlying the common faith, and develop this truth systematically. Of these scientific efforts, the deepest principle as well as the ultimate aim has ever been the idea of the Divine. It is the principle. The intuition of the Divine originates, informs, and sustains these efforts of thought. This idea is also the ultimate aim. To determine what the Divine is, and what is its relation to nature and man, to matter and spirit, has been the end towards which these herculean struggles look. In all ages this has been the great problem of human thinking, the solution of which has been felt to be emphatically *wisdom*, σοφία; whilst a lively interest in this solution and devotion to it, has also been regarded as the noblest endowment and the noblest endeavor of the human soul. Philosophy, accordingly, is the theology of the psychic man. It is the tendency and endeavor of the natural reason, laboring in the light of its own intuitions and according to its own laws, to know God.

Philosophy has indeed rendered much service to Christian Theology; but this service is formal rather than substantial. It has determined the processes, conditions and necessary forms of thought, but it has failed to attain to the possession of the objective contents of the truth, without which neither the reflecting nor the unreflecting mind of man can be satisfied.

Impelled by the force of the intuitive idea of God and of the relation of God to man, the human reason under the light and influence of the Gospel has ever been putting forth a similar effort.

As men must think and reflect, so they must think of themselves and the world in the relation which they sustain to their common ground. Whatever may be the conception of this ground, or by whatever term the conception may be expressed, this ground is God, or that which, in idea, takes the place of God; so that all the philosophical systems that originate and

contend for dominion where the Christian Church has been established, are at bottom theological speculation; an effort of man to grasp the nature and relations of God in the light and strength of his own reason. Opposite and contradictory as these systems may be, they are an earnest effort to determine the Divine in the sphere of thinking; an effort to determine what God is, and what He is not; whether He may be known or not known; whether He and the world are distinct, or one and the same; if distinct, whether He is separated from it, and rules over it externally, or whether He is present in it, and rules it by working in its laws and relations; if one and the same, whether matter is eternal or an emanation from the Divine Being. These and similar inquiries are all related to the idea of God. This idea is their fundamental principle. Were there no such intuitive idea, there would be no such inquiries; no hypothesis concerning a First Cause, or the great Architect, or an original principle; no question respecting creation or emanation, or the absolute and infinite, or mind and matter, or right and wrong, or Fate and Providence. In spite of itself every system of metaphysical thinking, whether negative or positive, whether atheistic or theistic, must derive its spirit and character from the relation which it bears to God.

It matters not what view we may take of Philosophy, we are shut up to the same judgment. Philosophy, in as far as it is what it claims to be, is only natural theology; either macrocosmic or microcosmic. The one goes outward and explores the great exterior world, the non-ego, in search of the ultimate reason or ground of things, and endeavors to determine and classify all known physical forces and phenomena in relation to this ultimate ground, law, force, principle or logos. The other goes inward and explores the little but more wonderful, interior world, the Ego, in search of the same original ground or principle, and, determined by a necessary intuition or an arbitrary hypothesis which is developed in the light of consciousness, endeavors to organize into system all metaphysical laws and forces and phenomena in their relation to the absolute Ego. No scientific inquiry into the physical world, nor any metaphysical

speculation, can ignore the Absolute. On the contrary it is just the intuition of the Absolute that originates and perpetuates philosophical thinking. It is the same problem that confronts both philosophy and dogmatic theology. The one seeks for a solution in the light of nature and of reason, or of the old fallen creation, the other in the light of revelation and faith, or of the new creation in Christ.

In the bosom of the Church there may also be scientific knowledge of God, or theological systems, that are not dogmatico-theological, or that cannot be regarded as dogmatic theology. A theological system may be based on a principle that is no more than an hypothesis of Christian thought. The logical development of the hypothesis may take up into itself all the elements of Christianity as given in the sacred Scriptures; but the position, relation, and force of these elements, as well as of the general tone and scope of the system, are determined by the hypothesis; not by the plastic force of a central idea that answers properly to the demand of the one faith of the Church. The objective, concrete order of divine revelation from the promise given concerning the seed of the woman to the final consummation of all things at the end of the world, though including two dispensations, is nevertheless but one; and it is one and can be one only in virtue of one general truth, which stands related to all the parts and relations of the objective order as a seed stands related to a tree, or as the one life of the human body stands related to its growth, the activity of its members, and all the phenomena of its mysterious constitution. That theological science may be valid, this one general truth as objectively it stands related to the supernatural order of revelation, must also subjectively as a principle of thought stand related to a theological system, determining the entire character of the system and all the parts. It must be the formative idea of the science, and determine the peculiar views which are wrought into it of all the subordinate facts of revelation.

Whilst we know very well, and in what we say do not mean to imply anything to the contrary, that no system of Dogmatic Theology has yet been wrought out that thus, in the sphere of

thought, is the perfect counterpart of the objective order of revelation, as face answers to face in a mirror; yet the fact of such acknowledged imperfection does not forbid us to say that any theological system, ignoring the organic unity of revelation and the all-controlling plastic force of one objective general truth, is radically defective; whether it starts in a pure hypothesis of the human reason, or in any subordinate fact of revelation. It may contain a large amount of truth and even incorporate a view that is measurably correct of all the parts of Christianity, yet as it does not acknowledge the authority of the historical development of dogmas in the consciousness of the Church, and does not aim at being a legitimate result of all Christian thinking as well as of true progress in scientific knowledge, such a system, while it is indeed theology, a scientific apprehension and reproduction of revealed truth, may not only but must also be distinguished from the theology which stands internally connected with the historic consciousness of the Church.

It is proper also to distinguish Dogmatic from Biblical theology. Biblical theology, using the terms in a restricted sense, aims at reproducing scientifically the consciousness of the Church in the beginning, or rather the religious consciousness of those who wrote the sacred Scriptures; and may therefore be divided into Old Testament and New Testament theology. At first view, it would seem, that no other theology is needful; but that simply to perpetuate, without adulteration, without adding to it or taking away from it, the form of apprehension which obtains concerning the economy of grace in the written word of God, particularly that concerning the person and work of Christ which is given in the New Testament, would suffice to meet all the needs of theological science in every period of the history of the Church. But such a view is superficial and unnatural.

So soon as we admit that the Church is an organic constitution, and as such perpetuates her existence in a way that is truly historical; and that history is a process of development embracing all the elements, forces and relations of human life;

an intelligent and reflecting mind can scarcely fail to see that the form of apprehension of the facts of revelation as this obtained in the germinal beginning of the Church, were a pure tradition even deemed desirable or sufficient, cannot in the nature of the case be handed down externally and mechanically, like a precious diamond, from age to age through the successive epochs of the world's life; and then stand in the consciousness of the Church of the nineteenth century, just as it stood in the consciousness of the Apostles and of the Apostolic Church. The notion of such pure tradition contradicts the law of the Christian life. The orginal form of apprehension can indeed never be superseded or supplemented, as if the sacred Scriptures considered in their original relation were either defective or contained any errors; but the original form lives in the Church as the force of an inviolable law determining the distinctive elements and the distinctive character of dogmatic theology in every age of the Church, somewhat as the type of an oak embosomed in the acorn lives on with determinative force in every stage and at every period of the growth of the tree.* The history of the Church clearly demonstrates that the original form of truth was, in accordance with the necessary demands of thought, taken up into the sphere of conscious reflection, digested, rewrought, and reproduced in a new form; the original form, though fundamental and possessing exclusively normative force for all Christian thinking, never having, taken as it is and by itself, been adequate to the varying needs of theological science. Thus has arisen the dogma, and dogmatic theology.

Dogmatic theology is the science of God revealed in Christ, that, recognizing the uninterrupted living process of thought going on in the mind of the Church from the beginning down to

---

* "Diejenigen, welche die Dogmatik überhaupt auf die *biblische* Dogmatik beschränken und die kirchliche Dogmatik ignoriren, haben dann freilich recht, die Dogmengeschichte als Anhang zu fassen. Uns aber ist die *biblische* Dogmatik nur der *Grundstein* des Gebäudes, dessen weitere *Baugeschichte* die Dogmengeschichte enthüllt, und in dessen *Ausbau* die eigentliche Dogmatik (als Wissenschaft) noch immer begriffen ist."—*Dogmengeschichte von Hagenbach.*

the present time, aims at reproducing the objective contents of faith in a form that is, on the one hand, the legitimate result of all previous achievements in the field of Christian thinking, and on the other, the product of free reflection, both upon this living process, and particularly upon the original form of truth as perpetuated in the sacred Scriptures; or we may say, in other words, it is the result of the development of the consciousness of the Church as modified by the free activity and original investigations of the present age.

The dogma accordingly, is not the revealed or scriptural form of truth. The Scriptures are the original form in which chosen men, inspired and guided by the Holy Ghost, recorded the facts of supernatural revelation, and wrought out, under this Divine tuition, the primal apprehension of these facts; a form, however, which is as really the result of the free action of their own minds as of the action of the Spirit, or the production of man as truly as the communication of God. For this reason they are unique, not only in character but also in point of authority. Hence they are now, as they have been since the apostolic period, the ultimate test of theological science. But the Bible itself is not scientific. It does not teach the truth scientifically; it contains no dogma, using the word in the theological sense. Were the Bible such a work and were its teachings dogmatic, it would cease to be unique. It would cease to possess normal authority for all periods in the history of the Church, and would sink to the level of the best productions of uninspired Christian thinking. The Apostles Paul, Peter and John would stand among the teachers of the Church like Ambrose and Augustine, or Luther and Calvin, or like Plato and Aristotle among pagan philosophers. Their position would cease to be distinct and different in kind; and their authority, at best, would only be superior to that of the greatest theologians.

Nor is the dogma the simple consciousness of the contents of faith. True faith involves necessarily a measure of true knowledge. The individual Christian knows that he believes, and knows what he believes. So also the Church as a whole.

There is a general as well as an individual consciousness of the Faith mediated by the Holy Ghost. But this immediate consciousness is only the soil from which the dogma springs, and in whose genial bosom it lives and grows.

Nor is the dogma the idea as wrought out by the logical reflection of the single theologian. The thinking of the individual is both important and necessary; but the conclusion to which he comes does not as such have authoritative force for science. His view of truth contains an element which we do not find in immediate consciousness, whether particular or general, inasmuch as it is mediated by thought, and so far forth cannot properly be ignored. But it has force for the legitimate development of theological science only in as far as the intuitive perception of the Christian consciousness of the Church-Catholic recognizes in it a valid expression of its own contents.

Nor yet is the dogma a view of the truth which characterizes a school or a community of earnest thinkers in the bosom of the Church animated by a distinct tendency of the Christian life. The distinct tendency may be valid, and the school a necessary factor of the process of dogmatic development. It may also be, as it commonly is, much more important and significant than the sporadic efforts of single individuals; for a school is itself to be regarded as the response which a Christian consciousness more general than that of individuals, gives to a mode of apprehending Christian truth. The tendency of a school is of still greater force, when it is not something new and original, begotten as it were independently in one man's mind, but connects itself with an idea or element of the Christian life, running back through previous ages, and manifesting itself clearly in every period of the history of the Church. Yet the views of a school do not as such rise to the position, nor do they possess the authority of a dogma.

All these, however, are valid elemental forces. The Christian consciousness begotten of faith in Christ, imperfect and faint it may be, is yet a mirror of the objective mysteries of the Gospel; and contains the material of thought. The Church knows by faith, and thinks on what she knows. Individual

members cannot but think; and this thinking is the effort of the new-born reason, to grasp what by faith is felt and known to be true, and give it form and order according to the laws of thought. A profound individual thinker meets a felt want; and shedding the light of Christian thought upon others, draws them forth from the common body into communion with himself. There comes thus into existence a school. A school is the thought-union of individuals. Prompted by a common want, and bound together by the force of a common tendency, they are engaged in a common scientific work. Such union of congenial minds is the condition of strength and progress in scientific knowledge. The end of thinking can scarcely be reached without it; at least, it never has been. As human life organizes itself into family and State, and Christian life into Church, so does every new phase of vigorous thought organize itself into community; and as an organic whole is always more complete, richer, and more productive than a single part can be, so does a thought community, as well in as outside of the Church, contribute much more to the legitimate progress and wealth of scientific knowledge than one individual.

There seems to be a law at work, a law in the mystery of the life of the Church as a whole, that renders necessary in order to the production and perfection of Christian dogma, a multiform process in which childlike faith, consciousness, individual thinking, and the rich fulness of community thought, are all spontaneous, determinative forces, interpenetrating each other organically as complemental elements of one movement, a movement that amid all the conflicts and contradictions that hinder its progress, looks nevertheless steadily towards attaining a form of apprehension which will on the one hand better satisfy the normal demands of the human reason, and on the other answer more perfectly both to the general consciousness of the one true Faith and to the original form of teaching given in the Sacred Scriptures, than the past or present scientific views of the Church concerning the objective facts of revelation.

In order to rise to the position and acquire the authority of

dogma, the result of thinking on the contents of faith must authenticate itself as valid to the Christian consciousness of the Church, and must be sustained, either directly or indirectly, by a decision of the Church given through the medium of a Council or Synod, or by some formal act which is tantamount to such decision. The doctrinal conception satisfies a felt want of the Christian mind, and approves itself to that intuitive sense of the truth which belongs essentially to the life of faith. Corresponding thus to the prevailing consciousness of the Church, and receiving her sanction in some positive form, the doctrinal conception ceases to be merely the private speculation of one profound thinker or to be the prevailing view only of a school; but rising from the sphere of the particular into the sphere of the general, it becomes the accepted form in which the objective Christian truth lives in the mind of the Church as a whole. It becomes the form in which the Church herself holds and teaches the truth which she possesses by faith, and confesses in her Creed. The result of Christian thinking having attained to this position, it is no longer a mere thought or opinion, but is a *dogma*.

A view or statement of a fact of revelation is the product of a subjective process of thought, and as such possesses no authority; but when this view becomes dogma, when affirmed and acknowledged by an act of the Church as a correct apprehension of revelation, then it passes into the sphere and acquires the character of what is objective. A dogma carries in itself, for the time being at least, the authoritative force of the objective fact. Indeed, it is the objective fact itself reproduced by Christian thinking, and set above individuals and schools as being the truth. Hence a dogma regulates the subsequent thinking, binds the teaching, and moulds even the life of the Church.

The authority of a dogma depending upon the direct authentication of itself to the general consciousness of the life of faith, this authority must vary both in degree and extent with the breadth of the Christian consciousness that has responded intuitively to the doctrinal conception, and continues to respond to it. A dogma, like that of the Incarnation, which

has lived in the Church from the rise of theological science, through every period of her history, and now characterizes every organized form of the Church Catholic, possesses a degree of authority which is equivalent to an article of the Apostles' Creed; and by it every minister of the Gospel and every professor of Theology must regulate his teaching, who would not be accounted heretical; whilst others, such as the Immaculate Conception, promulgated by Pope Pius IX, and the Limited Atonement defined by the Westminster Assembly, being of recent origin, and acknowledged only, each one, by a particular branch of the Church, can possess but a comparatively limited authority, and that only for the particular communion in which the dogma obtains. Yet every dogma, even if rejected by a large part or by the greater portion of the Church, is entitled to respectful consideration, and enters as a modifying force into the general movement of Christian thought.

Christian thought being a continuous process in the life of the Church, any given result, though raised to the position of dogma, can not be regarded as an absolute, but only as a *relative* conclusion. No dogma is a finished production that is to be handed down mechanically from period to period, and received blindly or unthinkingly by those who come after in the course of history. Indeed, such external tradition could not prevail were it even determined upon in a formal manner. The law of human thought forbids it peremptorily. The organic process of thought involves the necessity of growth or such continuous variation and change as belongs to the nature of human life. Even the dogma of the Incarnation cannot be handed down, in this outward way, as it stood in the consciousness of the Church from the beginning. Whilst as to its essence the same throughout all time as affirmed in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, it nevertheless has always been subject to variations, and will be hereafter. Thought in the effort to reproduce and make truth its own, presses on, as by a spontaneous impulse, towards a more complete and satifactory statement of this fundamental mystery. New questions, new issues, new relations, arise in every age, in the sphere of mind, to

which the statement of the mystery must be adjusted; or rather, new wants, practical and scientific, are generated distinguishing a subsequent from a former age, wants which are not and cannot be satisfied by a form of statement demanded by a past stage of history, but which require a new statement and a further development of the dogma, a development that on the one hand will retain the substance of the whole previous process, and on the other reproduce the substance in a form that will relate the Word made flesh, in idea, more thoroughly and consistently to all other facts of revelation, all spheres of life, and to all sciences lying outside of the specific domain of Theology. Hence there is in the bosom of the Church a history of this fundamental dogma as of all subordinate ones.

In regard to subordinate dogmas the variation is still greater. Some rule during an entire age, then are gradually undermined by more thorough investigation, and finally superseded altogether, or live on only as a modifying element in a subsequent, more complete form of apprehension. The first accepted theory of the atonement, as taught by Irenæus and others, that the death of Christ was a price paid to the Devil in order to ransom man from the bondage in which the power of the Devil held him in consequence of the fall, is now obsolete; whilst the idea of satisfaction to the divine law, demanded by the justice and honor of God, as reasoned out logically by Anselm, and subsequently modified and matured by the Reformers, was then unknown.

Though the necessity of faith in order to salvation was affirmed and realized from the beginning, yet the doctrine of justification by faith in Jesus Christ without the works of the law, as taught in the Confessions of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, and developed from a somewhat one-sided study of the Epistles of St. Paul, particularly those to the Romans and Galatians, was the distinguishing dogmatic achievement of the Reformation period, and constitutes both the principle of Protestantism and an epoch in theological science in general.

These examples of the development of dogmas may serve as a passing illustration of what we mean by saying that any par-

ticular result of Christian thinking, affirmed to be truth by an act of the Church, and thus invested with the authority of dogma, is only a relative conclusion. It stands for the time then being, but cannot stand forever. It cannot be regarded as the ultimate solution of a question, or as a scientific reproduction of an objective fact of revelation which can satisfy the ever-active and ever-growing thought of the Church in all time to come. It can satisfy only at a particular stage or during a particular period of history. So long as freely responded to and sustained by the general Christian consciousness, the dogma holds sway in and over Christian reflection, and governs the teaching of the individual authoritatively. But whenever history approaches another epoch, whether brought about by a false reassertion of the human or subjective element as in the beginning of the seventeenth century, or by the quickening of faith in the divine or objective as in the beginning of the eighteenth, then thought becomes restive in its subjection to the traditional dogma, and, whether for good or for evil, its authority begins to wane, and a diverging tendency begins to manifest itself.

There is then a peculiar commingling of contrary ethical forces. The dogma, though feeling its hold on theological confidence to be relaxing, yet seeks to retain its hold, partly from a sense of right, but partly also from the simple love of existence and impatience of contradiction, whilst thought refusing to be governed by external authority, without however intending to be lawless, and affirming freedom to be the birth-right of the Christian no less than of the natural reason, proceeds with a measure of independence of authority to inquire anew into the nature of the contents of the Apostolic Faith.

Underlying the ethical conflict, and ruling in the midst of seeming confusion, is the law of Church life, which, whilst it first and always demands implicit faith as the condition of legitimate ratiocination, also and at the same time stimulates and nourishes free-thought. The new life believes. It believes like a little child. But it must also think. It must think on what it believes as becomes a man; for Christianity is as really and

intensely human as it is gloriously divine. Through the silent and omnific influence of this mysterious law, the dogma is, in a certain sense, transcended. Though struggling to maintain the exercise of authority over freedom of thought, yet the dogma, no longer heartily sustained by the sentiment of allegiance, sooner or later finds itself to be king without a kingdom. The swelling tide of life cannot be checked by the metes and bounds set by authority. Free thought maintains its birth-right in the conflict, and achieves the victory. So it has been in the past; so it will be in the future. Born of free thought, and enthroned by it, the dogma must also succumb to the progress of free thought.

But whilst the dogma ceases to be king, the throne is not overturned. Nor is the dynasty abolished. Whilst the king loses his crown, the crown is not destroyed, but transmitted to another in the line of the blood royal.

The product of scientific Christian thinking invested with authority, the dogma not only stands for a time as the truth in the consciousness of the Church, and exercises a controlling influence on teaching, but it enters also as a factor into the very process of thought, which, in its progress, dethrones the dogma; a process that ever continues to be active and growing. The process may at times be suspended, or in a dormant state, like a man prostrated by sickness, or like a tree in the season of winter; but it does not die like a man or a tree. The thinking of the Church, like the life of the Church herself, does not at any period begin *de novo*. The Church has but one birth; so has dogmatic thinking but one beginning. If suspended or dormant, the new beginning of thought is the reawaking of what has been and even then is. The process resumes itself; determined by the immediately antecedent stage and through it by all the antecedent stages of development; just as a tree in he spring of the year resumes its growth. The dogma accordngly still lives, though the period of thought which gave it birth seems to be dead, and its authority as dogma may no onger be acknowledged. It lives not formally as dogma, but a s a necessary element of another stage of dogmatic science.

Even when its authority is waning, or when a prevailing method of thought which affects the accepted view of all the facts of revelation is about to be superseded, the substance of the dogma enters even in the act of waning as a plastic force into the organic movement, and conditions the ensuing result. The superseded dogma stands related to that form of apprehension which follows after as a particular stage of life of an individual stands related to his subsequent history.

The present status of any dogma is therefore to be regarded as the product of the entire process of Christian thinking that has been going on from the beginning of theological science. No achievement of any period is without value, no matter how long ago its formal authority was superseded; for it is one of the manifold ethical forces which condition theological science as it now stands.

What we have said of the birth and growth of the dogma, is valid not only as regards some one particular dogma, but as regards all of them. No one is an isolated conception, or an isolated product. Each one is directly related to the *general* Christian consciousness, and also internally connected with *all* dogmas; for the historical process which modifies and advances any one dogma, is only part of a much broader movement that comprehends the Christian life and Christian thinking as a whole. It is the life of the one Holy Catholic Church that develops itself; not only the life of single members, or of a school, or of one period. So it is the scientific thinking of the Church concerning the whole compass of her Apostolic Faith, that ever stimulated and nourished by her undying life is continually aiming at and struggling to attain to a better conception of the whole sphere of objective truth.

Every dogmatic conception being thus a member of a general movement, and subject to the law of development and change in the sphere of thought, it follows that dogmatic theology, or the science of dogmas, can itself not be a finished and fixed system of truth. So long as Christian thinking is not simply reflection on past achievements, not simply an effort to preserve these achievements sacredly, and hand them down to posterity, as one

may keep a precious jewel, but a living, vigorous and productive power in the Church, no system of dogmatic science can be finished and complete, and in consequence can not possess an unchangeably fixed character.

When Christian thought ceases to *live*, then all progress in the apprehension of revelation will be at an end, and a system of dogmatics may be wrought out in finished form. Then dogmatic science will have nothing to do but chew the cud, and teach others how to perform the same operation.

But as long as the life of the Church is indeed a *life*, and Christian thinking is true to its own vocation, the science of dogmatic theology, whilst it may never waver in yielding implicit obedience to the Apostolic Faith, can not be limited and governed by the modes and forms of thought prevailing in any previous age, but obeying the laws of its own history must seek to break away from all false limitation and restraint of the past, and press forward with freedom to a clearer, truer, and more satisfactory conception of the holy mysteries of the Faith. The science must be progressive and productive, no less than conservative and reproductive.

This general view of the nature and history of dogma and of dogmatic theology, involves a number of points which possess scientific and practical importance and invite further consideration. Some of these points we will notice by way of conclusion.

1. The origin and continuous growth of dogmas is an *objective* process. It obtains as a dynamic force in the life of the Church. The Church being a divine-human constitution in the world, no less real than the natural constitution of humanity, her life comprehends this dynamic force as a necessary part of its own idea; just as the natural life of mankind being rational and religious as well as physical, develops, in virtue of its being, conscious thinking, moral activity and moral feeling, and therefore also methods of thought or systems of philosophy, forms of religious worship, and civil government. Government, for example, does not originate in the will of an individual or of a community; but in the spontaneous action of human life;

and the relation between life and spontaneous expression is so inward and close that we cannot conceive of the one without the idea of the other. Whilst the form of government may depend on conscious determination and become what men make it, yet the necessity and general nature of government are not what men make them. The general nature is wholly objective. It is antecedent to and independent of conscious reflection, and lies in the social constitution of man as determined by the divine act of creation.

Neither does the will of an individual Christian or of a theological school make the necessity and law of Christian thinking. It is not conscious will that originates and sustains the continuous process in the life of the church by which dogma is developed. The opposite is nearer the truth. The general life of the Church conditions Christian consciousness, incites thought, and both informs and enforces dogmatic activity. Whether we will it or not, the movement is in progress. Even those who, opposing the idea of dogmatic development, are resolved to hold firmly the doctrinal views of a past age and hand them down unchanged to posterity, are themselves apprehended by the all-embracing power of the general law of thought-life, and constrained to hold views, be it consciously or not, which the age they endeavor to perpetuate could not and did not recognize as valid.

2. The process of dogmatic development being objective and continuous, no Confession of Faith or Formulary of Christian Doctrine can perpetuate itself forever. A confession is the exponent of the status of the theological and religious life of the age in which it was conceived and born; and is related to the Church of the past and to the Church of the future as that age itself is related to preceding and succeeding ages in the history of the Church. It possesses the truth, validity and vigor of its parentage, or of the life of the stock which produced it; no more, no less. Whilst the age lives the Confession lives. When the age dies the Confession dies; and when the age revives the Confession revives.

This law reveals itself in every period of history. Whilst the

theological life of the sixteenth century was predominant, the Heidelberg Catechism was honored, loved, and taught in the Reformed Churches of Germany, the Netherlands, and other countries. When Rationalism came to prevail and mastered the ruling mind, the general sense of what was conceived to be religious truth, unable any longer to endure this rich and mature production of the Reformation, set it aside and brought in other Catechisms that reflected the rationalistic attitude of the time. But so soon as the reaction set in, and the revival of a sounder faith led to a reassertion and reproduction of the doctrinal conceptions of the sixteenth century, these intruders were cast out as being no longer competent to satisfy the wants of the Church, and the Heidelberg Catechism was recalled and reinaugurated as the authoritative teacher of Christian truth.

Like changes, under similar circumstances, await posterity. If in the mysterious dispensations of Providence, it should please God to permit a similar decadence of theological life to afflict the Church, dishonor will again be put upon the Catechism, and it will have to give place to some new Confession that will be untrue to the Catholic Faith. Or should the progress of legitimate development of theological and religious life really carry the general mind of the Church forward to a better status than that of the sixteenth century, particularly if it should include a resolution of the Lutheran antithesis in the form of a new synthesis wrought out organically, then this general mind will demand and obtain expression in a production that, whilst conserving the genius of the Reformed Church, will yet be the exponent and witness of a higher stage of faith and knowledge.

3. The law of continuous dogmatic development denies the possibility of a *finished* system of truth; but it does not, therefore, exclude system.

Dogmatic Theology implies unity and logical order, in the nature of the case, also relative completeness. It begins in a principle, or in the idea of the fundamental fact and the essential nature of Christianity, then holds this principle firmly and consistently in the effort to apprehend correctly every part of supernatural revelation in its objective relations, and seeks thus

to reproduce the whole compass of the Faith in the form of an organic whole. Whilst this necessarily implies order and system, the science of dogmatics cannot be limited and bound mechanically by the outward form. The life of thought is deeper, richer, stronger than the form of thought. Christian thought produces the dogmatic form. What it produces, thought can and will also in due time transcend.* Like a tree, science, if alive, will outgrow its own form.

Nor is it necessary in order to its validity, that the science be able at all times to form a satisfying conception of all the parts of objective truth. Thought may be fresh and vigorous, true to all past achievements on the field of dogmatics and in the line of legitimate progress, yet, and for this reason, be unprepared at once to solve all the difficulties that encounter the movement. Analogous cases appear on every hand in the sphere of natural and ethical science.

4. There is ever a broad distinction to be made between Dogmatic Theology and the essential nature of Christianity or supernatural revelation. Christianity is not subject to any variation or change but that which is involved in the idea of the new creation as being an objective historical movement, which, fulfilling the Mosaic economy, begins with the Incarnation and passing through successive stages completes itself in the Second Advent. What it is in itself, is accordingly the same in every age of the world.

Dogmatic science, on the other hand, is a necessary element of the life of the Church. The Church being the organized form of the new creation in the fallen order of the world and thus a part of the new creation, is not, like her Head in the

---

* The students of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, as reported in the New York Observer, June 9th, 1870, sent a petition to the Synod of that Church, convened in New York on the 25th of May, praying for the removal of *Turretin* as a text book in favor of some more modern work; but after a warm discussion, the Synod decided to retain *Turretin*, as if an author of subordinate character, who wrote about two and a half centuries ago, could meet the present exigencies of dogmatic science, or as if the Institution were not competent or could not be trusted to do more than chew a cud.

Turretin is dead; and the resurrection in suspense.

state of glory, perfect, but is, somewhat like Himself whilst in the flesh, in process of realizing the end of her birth and mission; and therefore, under the sanctifying power of the ever-present Spirit, she moves through conflict and change from one degree of divine knowledge to another, in the full assurance that, though now seeing only through a glass darkly, at His second coming, having then attained to perfect deliverance from the perverting influence of sin, she shall see face to face, and know even as also she is known.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE HISTORY OF ROME. *By Theodor Mommsen. Translated with the Author's Sanction and Additions, by the Rev. William P. Dickson, D. D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow; late Classical Examiner in the University of St. Andrew's. With a Preface by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz. New Edition, in four volumes. Vol. III. New York: Charles Scribner & Company*, 654 *Broadway*, 1870.

The literary public will welcome the third volume of this truly great history of Rome. Since the days of Niebuhr, no work on Roman History has appeared, equal to this of Dr. Mommsen. It is designed, not so much for the professional scholar, as for intelligent readers of all classes. This volume, like the others, closes with valuable chapters on Religion and Education, on Literature and Art, as they existed during the period which the volume covers. The price of the work is $2 00 a volume.

WONDERS OF ARCHITECTURE. *Translated from the French of M. Lefèbre; to which is added a Chapter on English Architecture. By R. Donald. New York: Charles Scribner & Company*, 654 *Broadway*, 1870.

A neat 12mo. volume of 264 pages, finely illustrated, giving a connected and comprehensive sketch of the chief architectural achievements of ancient and modern times. It forms one of the Illustrated Library of Wonders, and possesses all the interest of the others that have come into our hands. We commend this Library especially for families, to be put into the hands of the young. Before they are prepared to read works which tax the thinking powers, they seek for lighter reading. Often their taste is corrupted and mind weak-

ened, by betaking themselves to novels, often without discrimination. These volumes will interest and instruct, and cultivate in them a taste for books of a proper character.

LIFTING THE VEIL. "*Which veil is done away in Christ*," 2 *Cor. iii.* 14. *New York: Charles Scribner & Company*, 654 *Broadway*, 1870.

Pious reading this little book furnishes. It consists of a series of conversations between two young ladies, the one of whom had lost by death a lover, the other a husband and child. The subjects treated are, the relation of the departed to those still in the flesh, the nature of heaven, with teachings on submission under trials, and supreme love to Christ, &c. The sentiments generally are such as would, no doubt, be sanctioned by the teachings of the Church. The book, however, is not strengthening in its influence, because it dwells too much on the sombre side of life—and moves too much in the sphere of mere sentiment and feeling.

From the same publishers, we have received Vols. IX. and X. of *Froude's History of England.*

HARBAUGH'S HARFE. *Gedichte in Pennsylvanisch Deutscher Mundart. Von H. Harbaugh, D.D. Herausgegeben von B. Bausman. Reformed Church Publication Board, No.* 54 *North Sixth street, Philadelphia*, 1870. *Pp.* 117. *Price* $1.50.

We have a letter lying before us, from Bayard Taylor, bearing date, September 27, 1869, in which he says: "I should, furthermore, be greatly obliged, if you can inform me when the poems of the Rev. Mr. Harbaugh were published. I have never yet seen the volume, and have been long wanting to get it."

The Reverend Frederick Waage, formerly a clergyman in the Lutheran Church, but for more than thirty years an "independent" minister, and a man of some classical culture, has again and again inquired, "*Wann kommen dann dem Harbaugh seine Pennsylvanischen Gedichte zum Vorschein?*"

The Editor of the "Bauern-Freund"—a German Weekly of many years' standing, in Montgomery county—has been publishing, from time to time, such specimens of the series as fell under his hand, and kept on anxiously to watch for the promised volume that should contain the collection.

The same may be said of the famous "Reading Adler," of the Allentown German Papers, and of the Editors of similar sheets, throughout Pennsylvania and other States, even; as well as, of many English minds of more or less culture, who have in anywise been identified or in contact with Pennsylvania German blood—yea, of many men of head and heart, without any taint or knowledge of the so-called "Pennsylvania *Dutch*."

"Harbaugh's Harfe," then, does not take us by surprise. It had

a number of couriers out, preparing its way and creating "great expectations" It is one of those coming events which cast their shadows before—not a dark one, though, in this case. The anxiety of all the author's friends, personal and unknown, will be gratified by the advent of this handsomely bound, chastely printed and happily filled volume of Pennsylvania German Poems.

The Rev. Mr. Brobst, of the Lutheran Church, who is just as proud as we are of our pedigree, says: "*Der Harbaugh hat eine neue Periode gegründet für die Pennsylvanische Dutschen.*" Just so, Brother Brobst, and if that be made one of the *points* in the General Council, we claim the privilege of voting in the affirmative. Surely, Henry Harbaugh had been a pioneer in this direction, and in the department of Pennsylvania German *Poetry* preeminently so.

Hans Breitmann crops out all over the field of Literature with his South German patois. He still continues to scatter his

"Pungent grains of titillating dust"

to the great delight of many. He too opened the way for that peculiar dialect to come in type. But let any one of sound heart and morals read "Hans Breitmann's" poems of mongrel sneering, low vulgarity and laughable bulls, to the full; and then turn to Henry Harbaugh's simple-toned and child-like echoings; to his home-sick wailings, faith-grounded utterings and heaven-longing musings—and he will feel the difference. Lay the two volumes aside of each other, and you have the sublime and the ridiculous together. "Hans Breitmann" is not to be compared with Henry Harbaugh. "Hans" mocks and is game-making over the faults and failures of the lowly and unfortunate. We feel, in his company, the force of the saying—

Der Spötter Strom reisst viele fort!

He forces a laugh out of you, but one is haunted all through, lest the laughing should turn into mourning. You fear lest there might be a sinning along with the laugh. He is a *Hans-wurst*, and yours is a condescending, supercilious, forced laugh, over which you are more or less ashamed. His jokes are taken from and put into the mouth of the mob. Even in serious and tragic scenes, he is ever low in style. As long as a poet does not intend anything beyond our amusement, we may excuse him, we well know; but always with the *proviso*, that he does never excite our loathing. But Hans *does* this. We never felt any differently edified from reading him, than we do from looking at the capers of a monkey. And his most æsthetic master-piece can do about as much for our emotional nature, as an ordinary grind-organ can.

"Harbaugh's Harfe," on the other hand, is safe reading in every

family. His poems belong to the naive class, too; but on account of their individual truthfulness, natural purity, strict religiosity and unalloyed Christianity, their readers are always the better for reading them. He always tells you something good in a jovial way, it may be, but still most becomingly.

Harbaugh has not only added another book to German literature, but he has actually enriched it, fully as much so as a *Hebel* did. He has not only multiplied verses, but expanded the realm of poetry. But what constitutes the main glory of the "Harfe" is, that no ancient or modern production of this kind can be compared with it. It is the first and only one in the field. It may remain thus solitary, for aught we know, for a long time. The spirit of naivete which pervades the "Harfe" unites and enlists the mind and heart of the reader. Schiller says, "A volume that can succeed in thus affording us a pure, healthy and never-flagging enjoyment, must be regarded as the work of a poet, beautiful, noble and deserving of approbation, irrespective of any objections that may be raised by a chilly conventionalism."

The editor, the Rev. Benjamin Bausman, has performed a labor of pure love to the memory of his departed friend. The editor and author had been closely allied in life for years. They met as strangers not so very early in their several histories, became companions, and finally friends, and *such* friends as to render it impossible for death to sever them.

Without any consultation with the lamented author, during their intimacy, the editor gathered the chords, which seemed to him to vibrate with such a melancholy air over the author's lonely grave, as if in sorrow for his demise, and solely out of regard for the hushed singer and his family, joins another friend in publishing "Harbaugh's Harfe." After the expenses are all cancelled, the plates, and title and profits and all go into the hands of Mrs. Harbaugh There is an opportunity afforded now to such as delight in "*sainting*" Henry Harbaugh, to substantially aid his sorrowing widow and fatherless children. We cannot help but consider as apt, that saying:—"Let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth."

The Publication House has done its part well. We are well pleased with the excellent taste displayed. May "Harbaugh's Harfe" sound in many a hearth and home! It will be as a musical instrument in the family, indeed.

LIFE AT HOME; Or the Family and its Members. By William Aikman, D. D., New York: Samuel R. Wells, No. 389 Broadway, 1870, Pp 249. For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, price $1.50.

This volume is neatly printed on tinted paper and bound in muslin with beveled boards, and presents a very inviting appearance.

It contains nine chapters, which successively treat of the family relation; husbands and wives; husbands; wives; parents; children; brothers and sisters; employers and employed; the altar in the house. These are most interesting topics, and need to be specially considered at the present day, when so many evidences of a growing laxity in regard to all that concerns the morals and interests of the family circle, are presenting themselves on every side. There are also discussed in a most forcible manner, and cannot fail to make their impression upon the mind and heart of the attentive reader. The views presented are sound and Scriptural, and must thus commend themselves to all who profess to be governed by the principles of the word of God.

OLAF THORLAKSEN. An Iceland Narrative. By W. Oertel Van Horn. From the German by Rev. Matthias Sheeleigh, Philadelphia; Lutheran Board of Publication, No. 42 N. Ninth street, 1870. Pp. 211. Price $1.00.

The Arctic regions possess peculiar attractions. They are, however, still to a great extent, far from being fully explored. Everything calculated to throw light upon them must, therefore, be regarded with more or less interest. In the present volume much important information in regard to those regions is interwoven with the narrative, which makes up the body of the work. The manner in which it is executed will adapt the work to the young, for whose benefit especially has been written. The translator also has performed his task, handsomely. Were the readers not apprised on the title page, that the work is a translation, he would be left under the impression that it was originally written in the English language. Works like this form valuable additions to our Sunday-school literature and cannot, therefore, be too greatly multiplied.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1870.

ART. I.—ORGANIC REDEMPTION.

BY SAMUEL H. GIESY, D. D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

II. SECOND ADAM—THE HISTORICAL CHRIST.

"As the antithesis between God and the world is not a mere semblance; and as there are created beings outside of God, which yearn for, and struggle backwards toward life in their Creator; the antithesis demands reconciliation—reconciliation too, not merely in thought and image, but in life and reality. As, further, the antagonism between the sinful world and the Holy God is not a mere pretence, but a solemn reality, not merely a hindrance and disturbance in thought, but a hindrance and disturbance in reality, the deliverance to be effected must be more than a deliverance of thought from semblance, it must lead back existing being to its true fundamental relations."

This language of the great German theologian* indicates the order as well as the necessity of that answering reality. The case absolutely demands, as a Reconciler, an actual Personality, forming the meeting-point between the parties to be reconciled, the complex or personal unity of God and man—the God-man—as man is the complex of the sensuous and the spiritual world. In the discussion of what justly ranks as the

* *Martensen's Christian Dogmatics; Edinburg edition, p.* 245.

one question of the age, every view which conceives of the Person of Christ, either as a Gnostic abstraction, on the one hand, or, as is more commonly the case, on the other, as the highest reach merely of independent human struggle and development —the flower of humanity—clearly falls short of that one mystery—GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH—which forms the living centre and soul of the Gospel, the full realization of the Divine Ideal of man, the answering desire of human aspiration, the personal substance of salvation, and the one enduring principle of Christianity. Historically, this personal union of God and man began in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ.

The necessity of the Incarnation may be regarded from two points of view. It has cosmical significance as well as redemptive virtue; is world-completing and world-redeeming. Man is the voice of creation. All at length comes in him to its full sense and meaning; all its fragmentary and scattered sounds find in human speech intelligent and self-conscious utterance. Man is nature's self-interpreting end. Hence everything in the vast cosmical process is seen steadily aspiring man-ward; each lower order preparing the way for, and completing itself in, something greater and better than itself, until man comes, the echo and explanation of all below.

But it is only in a relative, and not in an ultimate and absolute, sense that man is the end of creation. He is not an end to himself. He needs and reaches out after self-explanation. Thus the last sense of all below him, yet, following the prophecy of his own erect form, with upward gaze resting on his native skies, he only finds beyond himself the full meaning of his own existence. The human spirit is a yearning spirit. It is stirred by the loftiest aspirations. No man, who has thoughtfully communed with himself, but is deeply conscious of yearnings he wants met and answered, yet has no sort of power in himself ever to reach and realize. Properly understood and worded, these aspirations are struggles after, as they also indicate a susceptibility for, the union of the human with the Divine nature. The crowning glory of the human, its goal and self-interpretation, is a divine-human Personality—God joining

Himself to His own work under its highest form. "The grand ideal of life in man is that it be divine and human; and, perhaps, the grand ideal of life in God is that it show itself in one who is divine and human."*

Thus, in the way of cosmical completion, Christ would have entered the sphere of the human even had man not sinned.† He is the Mediator—the meeting-point of the divine and human; the self-revelation of the creative principle; the Head of creation—"the First-born," as St. Paul says, "of all creatures," the One not only *for* whom all things were created, but *in* whom all things reach at length their crowning glory and pre-eminence (πρωτεύων, Col. i. 18). The Incarnation was thus the end towards which the creation looked, and in which it found at last its proper completion. Sin being an incidental, and not an essential part of our original constitution, it was not dependent on that moral accident. It was no afterthought of God—an anticipative provision against a moral contingency.‡

---

* "*Voices of the Soul*," *by Rev. John Reid, p.* 29.

† Some Christian writers of the Mediæval ages, from Rupertus, in the 12th century, express themselves very decidedly on this point. Thus Wessel, quoted by Hagenbach, "Hist. of Doctrines," Vol. II. p. 34, denies that the human soul of Christ was a *contingent* creation. *Si incarnatio facta est principaliter propter peccati expiationem, sequeretur, quod anima Christi facta sit non principali intentione, sed quadam quasi occasione. Sed inconveniens est, nobilissimam creaturam occasionaliter esse introductam.* Calvin, with his usual vehemence, wrote against this supposition (Inst. B. II. chap. xii. 4). It is accepted by such German theologians as Martensen, Dorner and Lange. In his *Mystical Presence*, Dr. Nevin very strongly says, "Our nature reaches after a true and real union with the nature of God, as the necessary complement and consummation of its own life. The *idea* which it embodies can never be fully actualized under any other form. The Incarnation then is the proper completion of humanity. Christ is the true ideal Man. Here is reached ultimately the highest summit of human life, which is at the same time of course the crowning sense of the world, or that in which it finds its last and full signification. . . . This forms accordingly, without figure, the inmost and last sense of all God's works. The world, from its extreme circumference, looks inward to this fact as its true and proper centre, and presses towards it continually, from every side, as the end of its entire constitution. All is one vast prophecy of the coming of Christ." pp. 200, 1.

‡ "Are we to suppose that that which is most glorious in the world could only be reached through the medium of sin? that there would have been no place in the human race for the glory of the Only Begotten One, but for sin?" *Martensen's Christian Dogmatics, p.* 250.

But sin having entered, the Advent of the God-man, besides being world-completing, acquires also, in its deepest moral sense and necessity, world-redeeming character. Suffering is not in itself meritorious. This assumption of humanity formed absolutely, as will further appear, the only sphere of that redemption needed to meet fully the exigencies of the case, itself involved in suffering because sin brought sorrow and shame, pain and death, following thus its bad fortunes in order for its completest deliverance. Sin is not a mere idea, something notional, but a fact, and, as we have seen already, a most terrific and potent, besides universal fact. The answer to sin must be, not an abstraction, but a fact of a like potency and universality. Here, too, there must be the power of one righteous and holy life moving on with perennial force through the ages, sweeping the remotest corners of the earth and touching with its redemptive virtue the consummation of all things.

Our study of the organic nature of the ruin affected by the fall necessitates, as it has already prepared us for, a like conception of redemption as alone adequate. Sin has been seen to be, in no sense, a merely arbitrary and individual imputation, but a generic evil. The law of sin and death being deeper and broader than the individual life of the first Adam, broader and deeper also must be the remedial work of the Second Adam; it must have the character of universality, comprehending both our nature and humanity in their entirety. The redemption must first be thus collective before it can be in any real way of individual advantage and effect. The race in its manifold diversities must come to unity again in a second Headship. Christ is the predestined Unifier of the divided races.

In the redemption of mankind, of absolute necessity is its *homogeneity*. The new Head of humanity must be a member of the race—*an* Adam, a *man*. What is demanded here is not a fresh creation, but a *re*-creation. A creation entirely *de novo* would, in no sense, be the redemption of the old, but its displacement *in toto*—the substitution not only of something

entirely new but altogether different. This new Stock of humanity must, therefore, be a new creation of the old; not new in the sense of having a wholly independent origin—"springing by a separate efflux out of the earth," but new only in being a fresh movement from the creative Centre in the very bosom of the old. The constitution of nature is in order to the constitution of grace. In this St. Paul expresses not only the true order of the resurrection, but that which underlies and goes before it, the true order of redemption itself, "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual" (1 Cor. xv. 46). Answering to this necessity, Christ enters into the very bosom of the race by a true human birth. The Incarnation is a sublime reality. Christ stands in real connection with the whole order of human life going before. He is a man; not an idea; not an historical myth; not a Gnostic abstraction, but a veritable man.

Besides consubstantiality in both directions, the redemption of mankind requires also generic comprehension and real dynamic force, the power of a universal and not a merely individual life. Like the first, the Second Adam must be *the* man—incorporating in Himself humanity, as miscarried and ruined in the fall, and, in His own actual conflict with and victory over sin, and Satan, and death, lifting it out of its ruin, sanctifying, saving, and, in the end, glorifying it by carrying it thus successfully through temptation and the gate of death to a blessed and eternal life.

St. John expresses this sense of collective humanity, or a common nature, when he says ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο,* and

* This view of the case is thus clearly expressed in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, when in answer to the 16th question, it says, "The justice of God requires that the same *human nature* which has sinned should make satisfaction for sin." *Ter. Ed.* How full and forcible is Dr. Nevin's comment here! "To be valid at all, the redemption must go as deep as the curse. But this last attaches to our nature as such. Men are sinners. Their *nature* then must be restored, as the only ground on which it is possible for them to be saved individually. This is done in Christ." *Mystical Presence, p.* 210.

not ἀνθρωπος ἐγένετο. This would have been not the common nature of us all, but merely a particular individual—the one man Jesus—assumed into union with the Divine nature, and a necessary limitation of redemption to this one of the myriad units composing the race, leaving human nature as such, in unrelieved corruption.* In this trenchant passage (1 John v. 11), "This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son," St. John declares that every human being has a personal interest in the results of this new Headship—the life of "the true God"† to all men. St. Paul, too, over and over again gives utterance to this generic character of Christ. He sees all ethnic differences and national barriers

---

* The Cerinthian heresy, appearing before the close of the first century, asserted that the Λόγος entered into the man Jesus at His Baptism and separated from Him at the beginning of His Passion, thus making the human merely the outward appendage or temporary vesture of the divine. It was the opinion of Michaelis and others, that St. John wrote his Epistle to confute this first of the heresies in regard to the Person of Christ. At all events, in direct opposition to any such statement, he asserts, (1) "that Jesus and the Christ are one and the same Person, (2) that the one Lord Jesus Christ came *in* not *into* flesh, He did not descend into an already existing man, but He appeared clothed in human nature." "Deus Verbum non accepit personam, sed naturam; et in æternam personam divinitatis accepit temporalem substantiam carnis." *St. Ful. de Fide,* quoted by Liddon, *Bampton Lectures,* p. 259. The "judicious Hooker," as he has well been styled, thus writes, "It pleased not the Word, or wisdom of God, to take to itself some one person amongst men, for then should that one have been advanced, which was assumed, and no more; but wisdom, to the end she might save many, built her house of that nature which is common unto all; she made not this or that man her habitation, but dwelt *in us.* The seeds of herbs and plants at the first, are not in act, but in possibility, that which they afterwards grow to be. If the Son of God had taken to Himself a man new made and perfected, it would of necessity follow, that there are in Christ two persons, the one assuming and the other assumed; whereas the Son of God did not assume a man's person to His own, but a man's nature to His own Person; and therefore took *Semen,* the seed of Abraham, the very first original element of our nature, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence. . . . By taking only the nature of man He still continueth one person and changeth but the manner of His subsisting, which was before in the glory of the Son of God, and is now in the habit of our flesh." *Hooker's Eccl. Polity, B. V.* § 52.

† St. John clenches this assertion, first, (as in the passage above cited,) by distinguishing God from His Son, and then, by the quick turn so frequently met with in his Gospel and Epistles, by fully identifying the Son with the ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς—distinct in Person, one in Divine essence. Οὗτός εστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. 1 John v. 20.

broken down in this "one new man" (Eph. ii. 15; Rom. v. 15-18, ix. 12; Gal. iii. 28, v. 6; Col. iii. 11). All peoples meet in Bethlehem's Wonder. Hence, too, the corresponding title, *ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδαμ* (1 Cor. xv. 45), *ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος* (1 Cor. xv. 47), the parent of a new humanity; in a word, the archetypal idea of humanity in the Divine mind realized.

The best theologians, German, Anglican and American, take this view of the universal character of Christ's human nature. To the foregoing extract from Hooker may be added this one from Olshausen. "If Christ were only *a* man, as one along with and among many others, it would be indeed incomprehensible, how what He has suffered and done could be of any essential weight for mankind in general; He could only exert an influence by His doctrine and example. But He is to be viewed in fact, apart from His divine nature, as *the* man, that is, as realizing the absolute idea of humanity, and thus carrying it in Himself potentially in the way of the *spirit*, as truly as Adam did in a *corporeal* way. This character of Christ's human nature is designated in divinity by the term *impersonalitas;* and we find even Philo, with an inward feeling of the deep truth, describing the *Λόγος* as *τὸν κατ' ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπον*, that is the idea of man, the human Ideal." Quoting again from his *Mystical Presence*, Dr. Nevin says, "The Word became flesh; not a single man only, as one among many; but *flesh*, or humanity in its universal conception. How else could He be the principle of a general life, the origin of a new order of existence, for the human world as such? How else could the value of His mediatorial work be made over to us in a real way, by a true imputation, and not a legal fiction only? The entire scheme of the Christian salvation requires and assumes throughout, this view of the Incarnation and no other. To make it a merely individual case, a fact of no wider force than the abstract person of Jesus Himself, thus resolving His relationship to His people into the common relationship to Adam, is to turn all at last into an unreal theophany, and thus to overthrow the doctrine altogether. Christ gathered humanity into Himself as a whole, and was constituted thus its head

and sum, in a more full and comprehensive sense than this could ever be said of Adam."

In tracing the genealogy of Christ, St. Luke, the Evangelist for the Gentile world, and aiming, therefore, to make especially prominent the universality of redemption, carries the line of His descent back of Abraham, where St. Matthew, the Evangelist of the Fulfilment, stops, to Adam, the common centre of humanity. Like his teacher, the great Apostle to the outlying world, overleaping the narrowness of any national election and Divine preference, the author of the third Gospel connects Him with man as man. With him, He is not *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ* (St. Matt. i. 1)—the great boast of the Jew—linked to the *founder* merely of a specific kingdom, but *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀδὰμ*—בֶּן־אָדָם—a true shoot from the original stock, linked to all the sons of Adam, and also *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*—the Son of God in eternity, the Son of Man in time—answering in this mysterious complex of the Infinite with the finite, to Eden's Serpent-Bruiser—*the Promised Seed of the woman.** In this Evangelist's *Son of Adam*, "there was already in its germ the idea of a universal family, of a kingdom in which there was no respect of persons, and all distinctions of race and descent were broken down."†

---

* "St. Luke intends to show that Jesus is the Promised Seed of the woman (Gen. iii. 15; Gal. iv. 4), that He is the Second Adam—the Father of the new Race of regenerate humanity—in whom all the nations of the earth are blessed. . . . Christ as our Divine Head is here presented to us as the Author of the new Race which He carries up, as it were, by the retroverted stream of sanctification, turning back the channels of hereditary corruption and original sin, through every successive generation in an ascending series, and leading it through Adam to God He cleanses it by the divine effluence and effusion of the Holy Ghost." *Wadsworth's Greek Test. in loc.*

† Already in the second century this sense of St. Luke's genealogy—Christ, in linking Himself to Adam, heading up afresh all the families of men sprung from that original root—was observed. Thus Irenæus (B. III. chap. 22, § 3), says: "Wherefore St. Luke points out that the pedigree which traces the generation of our Lord back to Adam contains seventy-two generations, connecting the end with the beginning, and implying that it is He who has summed up in Himself all nations dispersed from Adam downwards, and all languages and generations of men, together with Adam himself." *Clark's Trans. p.* 360.

St. Luke's genealogical table is of service in another particular. In tracing alone the maternal line of this sacred ancestry, he brings out this unique and fundamental fact, that Christ was the "Son of Adam," but not after the ordinary manner of human generation. The parenthetical clause, ὡς ἐνομίζετο (iii. 22), is at once significant of that deeper necessity actually holding in the profound mystery itself. The Evangelist would say: 'Men, in their ignorance of His true origin, *supposed* Him to be the son of Joseph, but He was in fact without earthly paternity—Virgin born.' Therefore, the first link in ordinary generation is here wanting. He is not the son of Joseph, but boasts an exclusively Divine Paternity. God is His Father. The Creating Spirit, who first moved upon the formless waste, ordaining a world of living things, and afterwards was the efficient cause of the personal unity of spirit and nature in man, was again the "plastic principle"* in this mystery of mysteries. Hence the language of the annunciation, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (St. Luke i. 35). Here, in their deepest sense, was the meaning of these words of St. John reached and realized: "born not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (St. John i. 13)—the central activity being the holy will of the Creator, and, in no sense and to no extent,

---

* "The Second Adam, who sets forth the type of a new humanity, and is the starting-point of a new human creation, cannot be supposed to have come into existence according to the old Adamitic type. According to that type arise only beings who bear but in a restricted sense the image of God, all who are thus born after Adam's type are concluded under sin: and yet, nevertheless, the birth of Christ must have been a truly human birth. It would not do for Him to belong to the race merely as a stranger; without father, and without mother, and without generation (Heb. vii. 3). He must at the same time be born as a Son of David. This requirement, that the new Adam be born in the midst of the race, without the sinful race having any sort of self-determining and independent part in His birth; that He should be conceived and born of a woman without being linked by the fact of His conception into the connex of sinful human nature—is met by the Creed of the Gospel, and of the Church, which says, '*conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.*" *Martensen's Dogmatics, p.* 275.

the human. Thus, the mystery which met in His Person was the actual unity of essential Divinity and essential humanity: by supernatural conception the SON OF GOD, and by a true human birth the child of the Virgin Mother, and, as such, the SON OF MAN.

These titles, "Son of Man" and "Son of God," applied equally to one and the same Person, assert positively the realization of these two vast conceptions: the unity of mankind in Christ, and the union in Him of the nature of God and the nature of man, without the slightest confusion of attributes, or the destruction of both in a *tertium quid*. In the mind of Christ Himself, the first, His self-chosen name,* implied more than a community of nature and feeling simply with the lot of human kind. It carried along with it the full sense of that generic comprehension above referred to, and, besides, the remedial force of this theanthropic Headship. This self-sense of the title comes out in this all-embracing conception of His own mission: "The Son of Man is come to seek and save that which was *lost*" (St. Luke xix. 10). Thus, while He is, by the title, self-included with the race—one with other men—He does, at the same time, consciously stand immeasurably above any such separate individuality; in a word, comprises in Himself the whole race—the One Man forming the convergent-point of all precedent, and the starting-point of all subsequent, history.†

---

* Of the 88 times where the title occurs in the Gospels, it is used by our Lord of Himself in all with only three exceptions.

† "As man is, on the one hand, a single member of the great whole of nature, while He is, on the other hand, not merely a microcosmic representation, but stands *above* all nature, being the Mediator between the sensuous and the invisible holy order of the world; so also Christ. On the one hand, He is an individual member of the human race, not merely setting forth microcosmically, but also standing above the entire race, as the Mediator between the race and God. His individuality stands in the relation to all other human individualities in which the centre of a circle stands to all the single points of the circle." *Martensen, Christian Dogmatics*, p. 262. "The title Son of Man," says Liddon, "means more, in its application to our Lord, than His real incorporation with our kind. It exalts Him indefinitely above us all as the representative, the ideal, the pattern Man. He is, in a special sense, the Son of Mankind, the genuine offspring of the race. His is the Human

But in our Lord's own mind, the title, Son of Man, also went beyond even this evident sense—the truth of His humanity and the unity of humanity in Him. Taken in its far deeper import —its remedial virtue for ruined humanity, the Second Adam undoing what the first had done—it was itself an aspiration to, as, indeed, it only completed itself in that reciprocal title, Son of God, bringing prominently to view and fullest recognition at the same time His Higher Nature. How clearly this appears in that remarkable conjunction of the two titles, in that ever memorable passage (St. Matt. xvi. 13–17), where, boldly importing something beyond mere manhood, the inquiry is directly made, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" As much as to say, 'That I am; but am I that only?' "The point of His question," says Liddon, "is *this*:—what is He besides being the Son of Man? What is He in the seat and root of His being? Is His manhood a robe which He has thrown around a Higher form of pre-existent Life, or is it His all? Has He been in existence some thirty years at most, or are the august proportions of His life only to be meted out by the days of eternity? In marked contrast to the popular hesitation which refused to recognize explicitly the justice of the claim so plainly put forward by the assumption of the title 'Son of Man,' the Apostle confesses, 'Thou art the Christ,' and, advancing a step beyond this confession, quickly supplements the whole by adding, 'The Son of the Living God.'"

Life that does justice to humanity. All human history tends to Him or radiates from Him. He is the point in which humanity finds its unity; as St. Irenæus says, He 'recapitulates it.' He closes the earlier history of our race; He inaugurates its future. Nothing local, transient, individualizing, national, sectarian, dwarfs the proportions of His world-embracing Character; He rises above the parentage, the blood, the narrow horizon which bounded, as it seemed, His human life; He is the Archetypal man in whose presence distinctions of race, intervals of ages, types of civilization, degrees of mental culture, are as nothing." *Bampton Lectures, Second Ed. p.* 8. Baur also, quoted by this same writer, sees in this title, the clear assertion of His Messiahship, "Den Namen des υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου gebraucht Jesus Selbst auf eine so eigenthümliche Weise von Sich, dass man nur annehmen kann, Er habe mit jenem Namen, wie man auch seine Bedeutung genauer bestimmen mag, irgend eine Beziehung auf die Messiasidee ausdrücken wollen."

We have here in germinal utterance what alone can claim to be sound Christology. It is the prototypal confession—the parent of all that, in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, took more specific, and in the Athanasian metaphysical and dogmatic, shape. The central and determining principle here, as it must be in all safe and truly *Christian* theology, is the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In His self-application of these two names, there is a direct claim on His part to actual participation in the incommunicable nature of the Absolute Unity no less than in our common nature. Together they set forth this great reality—the one absolute need of humanity in its complete ruin—a theanthropic Personality and Life—*ὁ θεάνθρωπος* (the God-man); the old humanity receiving into its bosom, in a truly supernatural way, the personal presence of the power alone adequate to its redemption, constituting the One, in whom this mysterious union finds place, the New Stock of humanity—the Second Adam, the Father of a new race, the New Creation emphatically: "The Word made flesh." The first and fundamental fact of the Gospel, therefore, is the reality of the Incarnation. Here all starts anew.

Two things are determined in the presence of this great fact: the fitness of the human for union with the Divine nature, and its entire helplessness apart from the Divine. Man must be man's Redeemer; but the One, "mighty to save," must necessarily be mightier than poor man needing to be saved.

On the anthropological side, the true humanity of Christ was fiercely assailed by two ancient heresies: the one contending that human nature was so utterly fallen that there was no possibility of its redemption, because affording no ground for the actual union of the Higher with it; the other, an error at the opposite pole, contending that human nature was not so utterly fallen but that it could readily help itself. Manicheism held man to be irredeemable; Pelagianism self-redeemable. The one saw Him fast-bound in sin. Here no redemption is possible on the base of the old. The old must be wholly done away in the substitution of something entirely new and alto-

gether different—a creation *de novo* and *in toto*. Thus the Manichean heresy was found to fall in quite naturally with a corresponding error on the Christological side—the Gnostic reduction of the true humanity of Christ to a mere abstraction; something unreal; a transient wonder; a mere theophany; and not a real Incarnation. Pelagianism, denying the fact of organic depravity, and contending that every man stands where Adam did originally, boldly asserted that all man needed to rise to fellowship with God was self-stimulation and culture. This heresy, too, very naturally fell in with a corresponding error on the Christological side—the Ebionitic leveling of the true Divinity of Christ, assigning Him a place no higher than that of a noble exemplar and teacher of superior rank. Thus denying the actual need of the presence of the Divine, Pelagianism made the human nature its own sufficient help. It formed in this way the forerunner and baneful root of the prevailing Humanitarianism of the present day—the terrific curse of so much of our theological thinking and current literature—which sees in Christ nothing more than the Pattern Man, and wants no Saviour besides a Leader simply in the proprieties of human life.

Neither hesitatingly nor doubtfully was the real mind of the Church expressed. Both were pronounced fundamental errors, alike subversive of the Gospel and destructive of the necessarily real union of God and man in the Person of Christ. In the most positive way, the human nature was declared to be so far fallen that it could only be redeemed by the actual coming in of help from above; and not so utterly fallen as to be an unfit medium for, and so past all, redemption. Over against Pelagianism, the ground was decidedly taken that to whatever brilliant and complacent results the work of self-culture might be carried, man's redemption could not thus come from below, nor merely from within, but must proceed from above; over against Manicheism, it was just as decidedly asserted, that the human was not only the fit vehicle for, but the necessary base and sphere of, that transcendent help.

Just here the actual necessities of the case are made to appear: not a mere personification of God—the human for a time, invested with and acting out the attributes of the Divine. We dare not conceive of the Incarnation as being one with the occasional and transient foreshadowings of it, related in the earlier Scriptures, when, in "the Angel of the Lord" (Gen. xvi. 7, 13; xxii. 11; xxxviii. 13; xxxi. 11, 13; xlviii. 15; Ex. iii. 2, 6, 14; Num. xxii. 32, 35), there was a manifestation of the Divine presence for a definite end. And much less dare we conceive of it as of a piece simply with the empty parade of a stage-performance. A mere theophany—impersonal Divinity taking the outward appearance only of personal existence in Christ—like all scenic representations, an illusive and shadowy resemblance would be nothing other than a sad travesty of the great need itself and what must be its answering reality. Not a mere conjunction either of the Divine with the human. What is outwardly and artificially conjoined may be readily disjoined. In the nature of the case, an inhabitation could only have been a temporary relation. What was demanded, was not a shrine or temple for Deity, like the gorgeous cathedral, but Deity and temple in the living unity of a single Person. Not a heteroclite, a being, partly human and partly Divine—half man, half God. This would be the Monophysite monstrosity of a *middle* being—a compound, neither one thing nor the other, neither human nor yet Divine. But the need, and answering to this, the sublime reality was a veritable Incarnation—the essentially Divine and the essentially human in the unmixed and abiding union of one Personal Life; a Being wholly God and wholly man, both at once, and each wholly.

On both sides, the Incarnation is of necessity a reality. Mere abstraction, empty notion or show on either side, would have vitiated effectually the whole purpose and scheme of supernatural grace. The Divinity engaged must be no less *real* than the humanity; the humanity assumed no less real than the Divinity. In this Incarnate One must "dwell the *fulness* of the Godhead *bodily*" (Col. ii. 9). He must be "The Mighty God" (Isa. ix. 9)—not a divine attribute, nor a divine afflatus,

nor yet a divine messenger, an angel direct from the courts of the Most High—but the very God: in the language of the Athanasian Creed, "of the substance of the Father, co-eternal and co-equal." As we have seen already, no Oriental avatar, no impersonal theophany—neither abstract, nor yet representative Deity—would answer. There must be the great Incomprehensible Reality—the wholeness of the Divine essence. In the long and bitter controversy on the subject, the Church, over against Arianism, and with it sweeping modern Unitarianism and all shades of Humanitarianism, came, at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, to the emphatic declaration of the case in the adoption of that full word—marking in the vastness of the interest at stake,* for all ages, the grandeur of her victory—ὁμοούσιος, the consubstantiality of the Λόγος with the Father.

But the humanity must be equally real with the Divinity. Anthropological similitude merely is out of the question. Christ's humanity must be man's own. No transitory and shadowy appearance simply would serve the end. Again, He

---

* "How much it meant was proved by the subsequent efforts which have been made to destroy or to evade it. The sneer of Gibbon about the iota which separates the semi-Arian from the Catholic symbol (ὁμοίουσιον from ὁμοούσιον) is naturally repeated by those who believe that nothing was really at stake beyond the emptiest of abstractions, and who can speak of the fourth century as an age of meaningless logomachies. But to men who are concerned, not with words, but with the truths which they enshrine, not with the mere historic setting of a great struggle, but with the vital question at issue in it, the full importance of the Nicene symbol will be sufficiently obvious. The difference between ὁμοίουσιον and ὁμοούσιον convulsed the world for the simple reason, that in that difference lay the whole question of the real truth or falsehood of our Lord's actual Divinity. If in His essence He was only *like* God, He was a distinct Being from God, and therefore either created, or (*per impossibile*) a second God. In a great engagement, when man after man is laid low in defence of the colors of his regiment, it might seem to a bystander, unacquainted with the forms of war, a prodigious absurdity that so great a sacrifice of life should be incurred for a piece of silk or cotton of a particular hue; and he might make many caustic epigrams at the expense of the struggling and suffering combatants. But a soldier would tell him that the flag is a symbol of the honor and prowess of his country; and that he is not dying for a few yards of colored material, but for the moral and patriotic idea which the material represents. If ever there was a man who was not the slave of language, who had his eye upon ideas, truths, facts, and who made language submissively do their work, that man was the great St. Athanasius." *Liddon's Bampton Lectures*, 1866, *Second London Ed. pp.* 437–8.

must be, not *ὁμοίουσιος* but *ὁμοούσιος*—not merely like, but really man. Consubstantiality is equally necessary on the human, as we have already found it was on the Divine, side. The Church felt that the interest at stake here was no less vital than in the former issue, and the danger arising from Gnostic abstractions no less serious and, in the end, destructive also to the whole scheme of human redemption than the Ebionitic vagaries were sure to prove. And hence at the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 430, the real manhood of Christ, with equal care and directness, was guarded and defined, in applying to the Blessed Virgin the term, *Θεοτόκος*; in His indisputable birth of a human mother assigning to Him sameness of nature with her. Thus the Creeds: "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, *born* of the Virgin Mary" (Apostles'); "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made *man*" (Nicene); "perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and body subsisting; of the same essence with the Father as to His Godhead, and of the same substance with us as to His manhood" (Ephesian); "man, of the *substance* of His mother, born in the world" (Athanasian). And in full accord here with the Creeds is that grandest of all Christian Hymns (Te Deum Laudamus), coming down from the fourth century, sounding along the vast corridor of the ages, and taken up by generation after generation:

> "When Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man,
> Thou didst humble Thyself to be born of a Virgin."

And to all this may yet be added this language of St. Ignatius, *ad Eph.* 18: *Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας.*

This Mystery: *Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ*—the Divine actually and abidingly entering into the bosom of the human—constitutes the Second Adam, the new Headship of the race. It is a New Creation in that it is the introduction of powers which up to this time had personally never found their way into the order of human existence. It marked consequently a new era for the race—the personal presence of the Higher life in the

flesh. A new Pulse starts, and new Blood courses through the veins of our dead humanity. Our old Adamic nature is recapitulated—crowned and comprehended in its New Head. Hence St. Paul's full and grand conception: *ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν* (1 Cor. xv. 45). The same thought finds this fuller statement in Eph. i. 10: *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τα πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*—marred and broken humanity regathered under a Head, which, though tempted as the first, failed not. What is this but the inspired utterance of a generic redemption in the Second, paralleling and remedying the generic ruin brought in in the failure and sin of the first, Adam? Evidently the thought here is, that Christ is the Personal Substance and Perpetual Presence in our fallen world of that world's actual redemption. The possibility and power of it were alike immanent in His Person.

Irenæus gives expression to this same thought, standing as the caption of this Review, thus exhumed from the low burial which has overtaken so much of the Patristic theology, and given a new lease of life and as well working force in the thinking of the present day: "Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in Semet Ipsum recapitulans." Again, "Longam hominum expositionem in Se Ipso recapitulavit, in compendio nobis salutem præstans."* This re-heading of humanity in Christ, and the actual redemption of our *entire nature* and our *entire race* in the results of

* *Adv. Hær. B. III.* 16, 6; 18, 1. Dr. Dorner's note on Irenæus' frequent use of the word 'recapitulare' is of great value in a right understanding of his Christological views. "It signifies in general 'to return with anything to the beginning,' *i. e.* 'to repeat,' 'sum up.' To sum up is a repetition in the form of a collection of the momenta previously distributed. But because such a summing up in one, more fully exhibits a sphere, than would the exhibition of its scattered momenta, such a collection is more than a mere repetition, it is also a consummation of all that had gone before. It is a return to the idea of the thing; it is a fuller, a complete representation of it. Derivatively, it denotes when after a normal commencement an abnormal state has been introduced, 'to restore'—*i. e.* not to bring back to the former condition, but to set aside that which contradicts the idea;—a work which Christ could not accomplish unless He recapitulated humanity in Himself in another sense also: not merely summing up in Himself the 'longa hominum expositio' laden with sin, but also completing and setting forth humanity in its purity." *Doctrine of the Person of Christ; Div.* 1, *Vol.* 1, *pp.* 465-6. *Clark's trans.*

this recapitulation are statements frequently occurring in the writings of this and other prominent ante-Nicene Fathers.

Strangely enough, modern theology breaks with the ancient Church in its outspoken estimate of the Incarnation as the one fact necessarily of primal importance. It affects to see little or no atoning virtue in the wondrous event itself. It only comes, in its view, as forming the necessary *occasion* for all that was to come, in the way of penal satisfaction, at the sanguinary close of our Lord's life. In full keeping with this style of thought, the atonement is localized and centered in His death on the cross, while all going before and following after Calvary is set down as something of secondary importance altogether. The Incarnation thus comes to be viewed and apprehended as an incidental matter—a divine contrivance to meet an in-coming emergency—a means only to a suffering end, blunderingly failing to perceive that all that course of suffering was itself involved in the very *character* of the humanity assumed.

Sin being an incidental, and not, as we have already seen, the essential element of our nature, its consequences, suffering and death, are alike incidental. What was in itself thus purely incidental cannot be constituted the fundamental principle of the atonement. The fact of sin does but rule the form and conditions of that work. Proceeding upon the one-sided assumption that it was a work alone *for* humanity—the remedy of God for the penal consequences of sin—all such theories of the atonement leave out of view altogether that it was to be achieved *in* humanity, and thus, in following out the order of our fallen life, bringing the whole problem of humanity, in spite of all the hindrances foisted in by sin, to its actual consummation in the full realization of the Divine Ideal of man. Hence the early Church was occupied, not so much with the Atonement strictly, as such, as the Incarnation, well convinced that all redemptive merit attaching to the one must fall back upon the reality of the other. The central interest of Patristic theology thus is seen to have been the Person of Christ; not so much what He did and suffered, and

not that in any isolated way, but Christ Himself through His *achieved* sinlessness and victory over death, lifting up, sanctifying, and, in the end, transfiguring and glorifying, in His own exaltation, that *fallen* nature assumed into living oneness with His Divine nature.

As *fallen* nature determines the sphere of redemption, so it defines its whole scope and conditions. Recalling this, that the human will moving, consciously and freely, in harmony with the Divine will was man's high vocation, it follows that the atonement made necessary must hold in the surrender, free and full, of the very principle which disturbed and sundered man's relations to God above him, and nature below him. But with human freedom, broken away from the grace which constituted it and necessary to its right action, how is this atonement, in the full realization of that very vocation, at all possible? Every one born after the type alone of the old Adamic nature is touched by the force of a will sundered from its true centre and right relations, ever falling back under its destructive tyranny in every attempt to get beyond it, like the maimed eagle impatiently and despairingly flapping the earth with its broken wing in its vain endeavors to rise to its native Alpine elevation and freedom. "To bring in a perfect sacrifice," says Martensen, "two requirements must be complied with, which our sinful race was unable perfectly to accomplish: namely, man must *himself*, by an act of the purest free will, retrace and retract his sinful life, and begin a new development in love, obedience, and in rectitude; and withal this act of human freedom must at the same time be the act of the purest grace, God's own act in sinful history."*

Hence, in this second generic Headship, the remedial power is seen to lay hold of our fallen life in its first stage—its embryonic depths. Elisha's act at Jericho—"he went forth unto the *spring* of the waters, and cast the *salt in there*" (2 Kings ii. 21)—prefigures, whether divinely intended so or not, the point where absolutely the life of the new Humanity must begin, and finds, in the profound and more significant act of the Greater

* *Christian Dogmatics, p.* 306.

than Elisha, its last and best fulfilment. All the turbid streams of sin, we have already seen, take their rise in that hidden spring-head of corruption—man's conception in sin. And since the power of sin touches our life *in utero*, the power of actual redemption in Christ must also start in the pre-natal period. Hence the significance and real grace of His supernatural conception. He began His time-life, not where Adam did, in mature and full-grown manhood, but precisely where we all take it—in the womb. The fabled origin of the classic goddess of wisdom in the full development of form and powers, found no such unnatural and abnormal counterpart in His Advent, who is the deepest reason of all things—"in Whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. ii. 3).

"Conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary" mean something already in the necessary order of redemption as well as for faith. No more painful evidence of the general falling away of one side of our Protestant thinking from all sense of the redemptive virtue of our Lord's supernatural conception and holy nativity is needed, than the neglect of, nay, the actual dishonor even which, in some quarters, is put on the Christmas festival. Claiming to be *evangelical* (*par excellence*) though scouting the Creed as the relic only of a fossilized theology, it has no words of ridicule, bitter enough and fierce enough, for those Churches whose custom, ruled by the moulding power of that same Creed, it still is to hold in special commemoration the day of our Saviour's birth. It is quite refreshing, as well as thoroughly instructive in the right direction, to know that the Heidelberg Catechism, ruling the faith and teaching of the Reformed Church, giving to that ancient *regula fidei* a central place and normative authority, sympathizes none whatever with that radically defective theology which sees no saving merit in the marvellous beginning of our Lord's time-life, postponing all that to and localizing it in His agonizing death, as though that, apart altogether from the prevenient mystery of the Incarnation was or could be even the whole of

the atonement.* On the other hand, in its deep and profound sense of the necessity of an organic redemption, the Catechism sees that work starting at that hidden point where Christ first comes to touch our fallen life. Hence the significance and force of the question, "What benefit dost thou receive from the *holy conception and birth of Christ?* That He is our Mediator, and with *His innocence and perfect holiness covers*, in the sight of God, *my sin wherein I was conceived.*"† Thus, from the marvellous commencement already the objective historical order of redemption rules the Catechism, as it was felt and owned to have done so before in the very order observed in the Creed.

"Every human life is developed by contact with the world." By a real birth Christ is placed in the actual conditions of human life. His life looked forward to a real victory over sin, so the conflict, of course, must be real throughout. Breathing the impure atmosphere of a fallen world, touched by that mix-

---

* These vigorous sentences, from Dr. Nevin's "*Answer to Professor Dorner*," are right to the point. "The Incarnation is in itself of original and primary significance for the purposes of our salvation, in such sense, that the historical movement of the world's redemption must be regarded as starting in it, and having in it, its necessary organic principle and source. In other words it is not to be viewed as a mere outward device for making the Atonement possible. To this degrading conception of Christ, must come in the end all that way of magnifying His death, by which His life is made to be with regard to it of only secondary and more or less dependent account. The view is common among modern unchurchly and so-called evangelical sects; which indeed arrogate to themselves this title *evangelical*, for the most part, just because they lay all stress on the atonement taken in such miserable abstract sense. The whole Gospel is thus shorn of its proper historical force; and the result is, on all sides, a certain amount of unrealness and Gnostic spiritualism, which is sure to prove itself unfriendly always to true and vigorous faith." *Mer. Rev.* 1868, *p.* 601. Again, "Why should any one imagine that to magnify the Incarnation, is not to magnify, at the same time, the Atonement; or that the honor of the Atonement is prejudiced somehow, by the putting of honor on the Incarnation, through which only the Atonement is brought to pass? No such false abstraction finds any sort of countenance in the New Testament. We have reason to look upon it with distrust, therefore, whenever we meet it in actual ecclesiastical life. All that *Evangelicalism* (be it of the American or be it of the materially different German hue and shape), which affects to measure its zeal for Christ, by making low account of His life in order to make high account of His death, comes before us, to say the least, with questionable character; even if it should not be felt to carry on its front at once, by this very fact, the broad seal of its own condemnation." *Ib. p.* 316.

† *Heidelberg Catechism, Quest.* 26, *Tercen. Ed.*

ture of truth and error which prevails in every age, He was to repel, from childhood upwards, the impure and false as foreign to His being, and appropriate only such elements as would serve to advance His true, normal development.

Sin is the dark reality of our life. From birth to death it holds its course through ever recurring temptations and mournful failures. We are tempted but only to sin, over and over again. About these everyday temptations, there is nothing pantomimic, or scenic. He does but mock us who barely suggests the thought. We know them to be terrific realities, involving us, well nigh at every step, in shame and sorrow. They were no less such to our Lord Himself. Here was no fictitious danger, on the one side, and no empty parade of resistive powers, on the other. With our human life He assumed all the solemn responsibilities and tremendous risks of a true human probation—the experiment having against it all the disadvantages of a harder condition of things in the moral world than actually prevailed when the first fair trial came to such a sad and ruinous failure. For the problem which Christ, in the assumption of *fallen* human nature, proposed and accepted for Himself, was none other than this,—*viz.*, by personally identifying Himself fully with all its ill-fortunes, and sharing the very lameness superinduced by sin, to master, *in* it and *for* it, the infernal power which had wrought all the mischief and woe.

Of course, a condition precedent here was full moral freedom, which necessarily means freedom of action, again, either in the right or wrong direction. This implies in the Second, as in the first, Adam, the actual possibility of evil. Not at all uncommon are mistaken conceptions as to the sinlessness of Christ. To intimate the possibility of sin and failure in His case is to shock rudely the sensibilities of some persons. And yet under any other view, it is hard to see how our Lord's earnest and incessant conflict with the head-power of evil becomes anything more than a mere sham, taking from Him all proper credit for firmness and moral resolve, and from the work, as actually achieved through manifold hindrances, all real merit. But this height of moral sublimity, whereon He stands

in peerless and majestic solitariness, essential to His mission as Redeemer, "*without sin*" (Heb. iv. 15), does not mean a mere negative relation to sin—the absence of all opposition to the Divine will, child-like innocence—but a positive attribute unquestionably, *acquired* sinlessness; an attitude of deadly conflict with sin, and, the mastery of it always by the energetic exercise of His whole powers—something, therefore, achieved, maintained, and defended in spite of all the restless malignancy of hell, and under all the liabilities and felt solicitations to sin ever besetting human life. His immunity from sin comes before us, not as the overpowering necessity of His Divinity, nor the easy thing it is commonly supposed to have been by reason of that Higher nature, but the demonstrated element of His very being—fallen humanity in Him carried, by a crossed and hindered pathway, up to complete impeccability. This is particularly the case in those significant passages (Heb. ii. 10; v. 8, 9), where Christ's perfection, by which He made Himself the Author of Salvation to us, is represented as a real *attainment* —obedience learned by counter personal experiences of the sternest kind. It is this that gives the active obedience of Christ all its profound significance and real atoning virtue. Under any other supposition we must in fact give up the realness of the conflict, and as well the moral grandeur and redemptive merit of the victory itself.

The first Adam was not positively, but potentially, perfectly holy. The probation to which he was subjected was for the purpose, in the free and untrammelled exercise of his own powers, of developing this *posse non peccare*—the possibility of not sinning—into the higher stage of existence, the *non posse peccare*—the impossibility of sinning. Christ assumed, not the original unfallen, but our fallen humanity. In this second experiment, He stood not precisely where Adam had, but, as we have just seen, with immense odds against Him—evil, with all the prestige of victory in the sphere of the human world and its consequent enthronement in the very constitution of nature, armed with more terrific power against the possible realization of this Divine Ideal of man, perfect holiness. Thus, the dis-

advantages of the situation, the tremendous risks involved, and the fierceness of the opposition encountered, all this considered, we come to an appreciative sense both of the reality and greatness of His vast moral achievement—human nature, tempted, tried and miscarried in Adam, lifted up in Him to the sphere of actualized sinlessness. Meeting sin as we meet it, but ever thrusting it aside, He fully demonstrated Himself the Sinless One, the Captain of our Salvation.

German theologians especially are exceedingly rich in the development of this thought. "Although the idea of Christ as Redeemer implies that in Him the possibility of sinning was never realized, yet is He the Sinless One, only in so far as it was possible for Him to sin. He could not have been the Redeemer if He had sinned, and as Redeemer it is inconceivable that He should have sinned: but the idea of a Redeemer can only be realized by one who, though He might have sinned, did not sin. In a word, He is the Redeemer of men, not as QUI NON POTUIT PECCARE, but as QUI POTUIT NON PECCARE." *Steudel's Glaubenslehre*, quoted by Ullmann, who, in his masterly treatise on "The Sinlessness of Jesus," carries out, at still greater length, the same idea. "The possibility of sin did indeed exist in the case of Jesus, but this possibility never became actual fact; sin was ever foreign to Him and far from Him, outwardly as well as inwardly; was even absolutely excluded by virtue of the moral power He possessed in highest purity and fulness, which in all circumstances proved itself victorious. We are entitled to view the matter in this light by the consideration, that, in the doctrine of the Apostles, the perfect manhood of the Redeemer is affirmed. For, even in those passages in which the Godhead of Christ is most explicitly affirmed, there is no intention to detract anything from the perfection of His human nature. Now the possibility of sin can never be severed from human nature, created as it is and placed under the law of development. Nor will we be unwilling to admit the possibility of sin in the case of Jesus, if we only rightly understand what is meant by this admission, and are careful to distinguish the possibility of sinning from a

leaning or bent towards sin. The two things must certainly be distinguished: sin may be possible where it does not really exist, no, not in the faintest degree; but a *penchant* towards sin is inconsistent with sinlessness, for it involves a germ, a minimum of sin. This possibility of sin must, moreover, be presupposed ere we can conceive that Jesus could be tempted. The power of being tempted does not certainly in itself imply the existence of any evil; for even the purest virtue, if it dwell in a finite nature, is liable to be tempted. Now the fact that Christ could be tempted, is presented to us in the Scriptures as one of the most marked features of His history. Nay more, it is held up as the indispensable condition of His typical character. And, indeed, it is only on the supposition that He took part in our nature not merely apparently, or partially, but really and perfectly, that He can be our Pattern, Ideal, and Example. * * * For His nature was human—it developed and unfolded itself after a human fashion; it was not, like the nature of God, holy of absolute necessity. Moreover, the mission of His life was of such a character that, in order to fulfil it, He had to combat, through heaviest fights and sorest temptations, which at every movement summoned into activity His whole moral might. All that we then mean when we speak of the sinlessness of Jesus is, that the possibility of sinning which existed in Him never attained any actual reality, but was constantly nullified and abolished by His perfect surrender of Himself to God and His will."*

His history shows how true is this judgment. Taking up human life at its earliest period, it involved Him in actual conflict with temptation and sin, peculiar to every successive age. The reigning characteristic of childhood is self-will. From this bitter root of hereditary evil springs downright disobedience —attempted self-direction, and consequent impatience of paternal authority and control. The child is not who makes no effort to break away from their exercise. Of necessity the elimination of sin began at that point of His life. Though we

* *"Sinlessness of Jesus," Clark's Ed. pp.* 48, 49.

have no record of the fact, yet we cannot doubt that Christ met the temptation to self-will and disobedience peculiar to childhood. Thrice sorely tempted, on the threshold of His public ministry, to break away from the will of the Higher, we may well suppose, the temptation would not have been wanting to break away also from that of the lower, relationship. A hint, at all events, is given us into the respectful and submissive nature of His child-life (St. Luke ii. 52). We see Him honoring the parental relation, as an ordinance of God; bowing to the parent's right to command, and the child's duty to obey, and in doing so restoring this period of life to its normal character and touching it also with the real merit of His own holy obedience.

This victory over the lawless spirit of childhood was repeated in after years, when as a man He took His place among men. To one standing on the threshold of manhood and canvassing the grave question—*life's vocation*—the most potent temptation, then as now, was *self-seeking*—the open path of pleasure, gain, or ambition. Though standing on the ground precisely which man as man occupied, yet was Christ not caught even in the outer circlings of this fearful maelstrom of worldliness. All round Him, men were occupied with their own plans, living for themselves. His life was, by His own free choice and determination, steadily ruled by a different principle, and throughout moved towards its own highest end. He thus states what He proposed to Himself: "I came down from heaven, not to do My own will, but the will of Him that sent Me" (John vi. 38). This, indeed, was the primordial rule of human life. But, in the full maturity of his powers, under the instigation of the Devil, the first Adam broke away from it, and dragged the race after him in the same course of self-centricity. Come to manhood, the Second Adam, in the face of the accumulated force of centuries of false direction, must bring the race back to its right orbit and true centre—doing, and doing always, the will of God (John viii. 29).

Nor were temptations wanting to induce Him to make His own separate and independent will the rule of His activity (St.

Matt. iv. 1–11). Hence again the profound significance and real merit of His holy obedience—maintaining in a protracted struggle His integrity, whereas the first Adam failed in the very first instance. Thus it is, that the righteousness of His tempted, but holy manhood covers, in the sight of God, the selfishness, sensuality and sin of ours, sanctifying and lifting it up by Himself passing sinlessly through it.*

The struggle closes not with this signal victory at the very outset of His public career. The Satanic assault in the wilderness upon His sacred purpose may be said, in fact, only fairly to have inaugurated the dark hostility arrayed from all quarters against this noble Champion of Humanity. We only come to some proper judgment of the terrific nature of the conflict and His just credit for unwavering steadfastness, when the forces are reviewed which were matched against Him. Even the brief form of its presentation of the facts, the record is of vast service in this regard. It shows that His life was not spent in a serenity of atmosphere disturbed by no secret intrigues, or dark conspiracies, or pursuing hate, or open hostility, or the treachery of professed friends. No life was so crossed and hindered. Of all persons He was the least appreciated and the most bitterly hated. The men in place and power, civil and ecclesiastic, were opposed to Him. The race, save a few uninfluential and uneducated persons, may be said to have been lifted up against Him. He encountered the most intolerant bigotry. Alike obnoxious to Pharisees and Sadducees, Ascetics and Mystics, the leaders of all the religious sects of the day united in their hatred and intrigues against Him, and at length, under the most violent and cruel circumstances, compassed His death.

Baffled and defeated in the desert, Gethsemane is made the scene of Satan's more confident approach. That hour of dark-

---

* This clearly was St. Paul's mind when, in that ever memorable parallel drawn between the natural and supernatural Headship, he says most definitely, Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτω καὶ δι ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς (Rom. v. 18).

ness was to the Prince of darkness his season of greatest power, as it was our Lord's season of greatest fear and weakness. Here by the avenue of pain that is attempted which, in the first instance, by the avenue of pleasure and personal glory, had signally failed. The shadow of the Cross darkens now the way of holy obedience. Before a bowed soul stands in appalling proximity this extremest test of self-surrender to the perfect will of the just God. The end necessary to crown a whole life of filial submission and self-sacrifice is obedience unto death— "*even the death of the Cross.*" "Even" is intensive, indicating the bitter extremity of the test to which His holy obedience was subjected.

Now by that allotment of appalling severity shall He be turned aside from fulfilling His purpose of grace? At the dire end, shall submission fail Him and, in the failure again of its Head, every hope of the recovery of the race perish for ever? There was a fearful possibility of this. If the record be not mere fiction, it details a crisis in the mind of the Second Adam, when all was made to tremble again upon the decision of one man's will. It was a moment awful in its sublimity. Above that midnight Suppliant the very heavens bend with breathless anxiety. All alone is He left, in that hour of agony, to decide a world's destiny. For, the record tells us, it was not until after this expression of full submission, "Nevertheless not My will, but Thine, be done," that a messenger was sent from the Father on his *strengthening* mission (St. Luke xxii. 43). "What, in this way, the Cross sums up, it also helps to interpret; setting before us as it were, in one view, all the features of that sustained struggle of which it was itself the last and fiercest strife, all the depths of that atoning love of which it was itself the full and effectual outpouring. Not that His last suffering is in any way to be arbitrarily separated from the rest; but that it was the coming to a head of all that had gone before, and thus drew together in one scene of unsurpassed solemnity and of deepest reality what had scarred, in sundry forms and in various degrees of intensity, all the previous period of His earthly travail."

In tracing thus the course of this successful probation, the *whole* life of Christ is seen to be redemptive. Touching every period with the fact of an assailed but maintained sinlessness, He touched it with the virtue of an effective atonement. Patristic theology is especially refreshing on this renewal of human nature by its new Head actually passing through its several stages. None speaks out here more definitely and beautifully than Irenæus: "He did not set aside or pass beyond the human, nor annul the law of the human race in Himself, but He took up into Himself, and sanctified every age of human life through which He passed, through that likeness which it bore to Himself. For He came to save all—all, I say, who through Him are born again into God—infants, children, boys, youths, and men. Therefore, He passed through every age, and was made an infant for infants, sanctifying infants; and a child for children, sanctifying those being of this age, and at the same time being an example to them of the efficacy of piety, and of righteousness, and of subjection. He was made a youth for youths, being an example to the youth, and sanctifying them to the Lord. And in like manner, He became a man for men, that He might be a perfect Leader to all, not only in the way of setting forth the truth, *but in the way of actual being*, sanctifying, at the same time, the men, and being also an example to them."*

* *Irenæus Adv. Hær.* II. 22. De Pressensé, in his recent work, gives clear expression to this same thought: "The holy life of Jesus bears, from its commencement to its close, a redemptive character, because it is one long sacrifice of obedience and love. Human life is thus restored to its normal condition; thenceforward the bitter consequences of the fall freely accepted, are transformed in acts of reparation; wherever the first Adam introduced rebellion, the Son of Man, the Head of the new race, substitutes entire submission and perfect holiness: He brings reconciliation out of the punishment itself; for, while we who have merited it must needs endure it, He voluntarily accepts it, and submits Himself to it, thus raising it to the height of a holy sacrifice. He restores the harmony between God and man, and re-unites the moral link which was broken at the fall. Therefore, that which is of highest import in the ministry of Jesus, is neither the contest with His enemies nor even the education of His Apostles, but His life itself—that human life, like that of other men, save for the defilement of sin, but transformed into one continual sacrifice. 'My meat and My drink,' He said, 'is to do the will of Him that sent Me.' This is the motto and the epitome of His whole career." *Jesus Christ, His Times, Life, and Work; London*, 1866, *pp.* 319–320.

The Heidelberg Catechism joins in ascribing to the whole life of Christ this perpetual, redemptive character. This cannot be doubted when the answer to *Quest.* 37 is carefully considered. "What dost thou understand by the word *suffered?* That *all the time He lived on earth*, but especially at the end of His life He bore in body and soul, the wrath of God against the sin of the whole human race; in order that by His passion, as the only atoning sacrifice, He might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation and obtain for us the grace of God, righteousness and eternal life." It is quite easily seen, that there is here no arbitrary and abrupt sundering of the later from the earlier sufferings, but all are alike included in the work of redemption —in the phrase, "all the time He lived on earth," sweeping from the Cross itself back to the rude and lowly manger.* Although rightly special prominence is given to Gethsemane's conflict, the night of agony, the judicial procedure, the binding and scourging, the royal mockery with its crown of thorns, Calvary's darkness and tragic end, yet the anterior humiliation and sufferings are properly taken to be a part of the "atoning sacrifice," having a like meritorious virtue with what is more definitely spoken of as the Passion. And this clearly is the sense also of Ursinus, the principal author of the Catechism. By the term Passion, he tells us, "we are to understand the *whole humiliation*, all the miseries, infirmities, griefs, torments, and ignominy to which He was subject, for our sakes, *from the moment of His birth* even to the hour of His death, as well in soul as in body."† Again, in answer to the question, "What is our righteousness before God?" he tells us: "The *entire humiliation of Christ*, from the moment of His conception to His glorification, including His assumption

* In support of this inclusive character of the atonement, Monsell, quoting this question of the Catechism, makes the pertinent remark: "The Incarnation itself was a sacrifice of which the strong crying and tears of Gethsemane, and the agony of Golgotha, were the highest term. His passion and His death began with His life in a world where sin and its consequences reign." *The Religion of Redemption. London*, 1867, *p.* 67.

† *Dr. Williard's Ursinus, p.* 212.

of humanity," &c.* Following here the oldest and the best Patristic theology, the *whole life* of Christ, from its pre-natal beginning to its triumphant end in His glorious Ascension, is properly taken to be redemptive—our fallen life, in all its stages, lifted up, in His own holy life, to its true normal idea.

The Litany of the Ancient Church, recited on bended knees, under circumstances the most trying, by martyrs, confessors, and saints of all ages, "devoutly ascribes atoning merit to every act of our Lord's life, from the depths of the womb to the heights of the heavens,"—thus:

By the mystery of Thy holy Incarnation;
By Thy holy Nativity and Circumcision;
By Thy Baptism, Fasting, and Temptation;
By Thine Agony and Bloody Sweat;
By Thy Cross and Passion;
By Thy precious Death and Burial;
By Thy glorious Resurrection and Ascension;
And by the coming of the Holy Ghost.
In all time of our tribulation;
In all time of our wealth;
In the hour of death and in the day of judgment,
Good Lord, deliver us."

But sin was more than this principle of universal corruption. It was the principle also of physical disorder ending at last in death. The ruin went deeper than man's moral relations and time-life. The redemption must go deeper. Our Second Head must follow here the ill-fortunes of the bad leadership of the first. The Victor over sin in the wilderness, in the garden, and on Calvary's stained hill-top, must be the Vanquisher also of Hades. Besides the principle of Personal Sinlessness over against the principle of universal corruption, complete redemption is the "Power of an endless Life" over against the reigning law of death. As in the sphere of the moral, so in the

* *Dr. Williard's Ursinus, p.* 237.

sphere of the physical, life, there must be in Christ's own Person—a real conflict with and a real victory over the law of death, involving here germinally a like victory over it for the race.

The bitter sting must pierce His own soul in order to its being plucked out; the yoke be temporarily borne in order to its being effectually broken. No Elijah-like translation could meet the exigencies of the case. He must follow the dying race. Through the gates of the grave lies the pathway to glory for Himself, and for us through Him (St. Luke xxiv. 26). To carry us on high, His sacred head must lie as low as ours. To carry away, like another Samson, the gates of this vast Necropolis, He must Himself become a prisoner within its gloomy walls. The order of redemption here is the order which sin itself imposed, and hence, the Creed follows: "dead and buried; descended into hades." Not a Divine word of life spoken, as "Let there be light," would at all answer. As death itself came in, not in the form of an abstract principle, but the one deed of a generic Personality, so the gift of life to dead and dying humanity could come in, not in the form of an omnific word, but again only by the deed of a concrete Actor. "*Since* by man came death, by *man* came also the resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 21). Death was not an accident, but an inexorable necessity, to Christ. He must be obedient unto death in order gloriously to realize His own Divine Name and Proclamation: "I AM THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE" (St. John xi. 25): "I AM ALIVE FOR EVERMORE, AND HAVE THE KEYS OF HADES AND OF DEATH" (Rev. i. 18). Plunging with the first into the dusty regions of the dead, our Second Head finds for us the lost path-way of Life.

Latin hymnology is especially full and rich in the expression of this thought. This is a characteristic specimen, taken from the Mediæval period, *Peter the Venerable*, † 1156.

"Mortis portis fractis, fortis
Fortior vim sustulit;
Et per crucem regem trucem,
Infernorum perculit.

Lumen clarum tenebrarum
Sedibus resplenduit;
Dum salvare, recreare
Quod creavit voluit.
Hinc Creator, ne peccator,
Moreretur, moritur;
Cujus morte, nova sorte,
Vita nobis oritur.
Inde Sathan victus gemit,
Unde Victor—nos redemit."

Everywhere, in gospels and epistles, to Churches and individuals, the New Testament is one and the same Gospel—THE GOSPEL OF THE RESURRECTION—a Reality for all alike in the Person of the one Risen Redeemer. It means much towards a true conception of the Gospel itself that such supreme account is made throughout of the *Risen Life* of the Victorious Saviour. Not alone with St. Paul, but continually, it is the one theme, "JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION"—the Personal Christ, who "suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried," but "declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4). It would be an easy matter, by almost endless citations, to show that this is the true and only sense of the Gospel. "With great power," it is said, "gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus;" and the result as announced, is heaven's own seal of approbation on this as the only true sense of the Gospel itself: "And the *Lord* added to the Church daily such as should be saved" (Acts ii. 47).

But the actual order of redemption stops not here. It could not stop here. To be a *complete* redemption and what is an incomplete redemption but a sad vitiation of the whole? —it must go farther for Himself and for us. The resurrection simply would give us no more than a mundane life under a higher form. Is the resurrected body still to remain apart from free and full fellowship with God? Are the children of the heavenly King to be left forever in the outer courts of His glory? The first consequence of sin was the banishment of the fallen Adam from the earthly Paradise

in which God had placed him. That expulsion went beyond that home of primitive innocence and happiness. The earthly was here but the type of the Heavenly; and bodily expulsion from the lower carried along with it a like exclusion from the higher. But now, thrust out by sin from the Eden below, where without fear he communed face to face with his Maker, shall this exiled and banished nature ever be admitted into the Eden above? Or shall man, even resurrected man, remain forever an exile from home, a stranger to his Father—an Ishmaelite, doomed to wander, with unresting foot, up and down the earth with not the most distant prospect of ever being admitted into the eternal dwelling-place of God? Evidently the work of redemption was not complete in the resurrection of our Lord separately taken.

From the first it looked to the full restoration of our exiled nature to God's eternal presence and favor. This end was reached in the bodily return to His native skies of the Second Adam, "the Lord from heaven." "Received up into glory," is the wondrous fact closing, for the time, the history of this One Wondrous Life. But His glorification was also far more than the completion and crown simply of His own work. Like all that went before, Incarnation, atoning Death and glorious Resurrection, His visible Ascension carries with it generic significance and effect—involving the full glorification, in the end, of all incorporated into this New Headship of redeemed Humanity. We looked forward, therefore, with joyful expectation to His second Advent, claiming the eternal abode in God's immediate presence and the perpetual admiration of all those who believe.

Thus an organic ruin has been met by an organic redemption. Humanity stands actually redeemed. The Christ of history, not the Christ of mere dogma, is, to the end of time, the very Substance and the perennial Presence of salvation to our ruined world. The Gospel lies in these primordial facts, and not in any doctrines about Christ, or systems and theories built upon them. Hence His relation to redemption is causative and dynamic, not incidental, or merely pedagogic, and our

relation to Him must be not imputative simply, but, in its deepest sense, truly participative.

Just here the Unitarian conception of Christ, *et id omne genus*, shows its radical defectiveness. On this view, He is simply a Teacher—partly by His beautiful example, and partly by ethical rules of a superior order, leads on to a life at once noble and sublime. His life, in this way, is only pedagogic; in its best sense, it is true, but He is still nothing more than the Pattern Man. Commonly placed at the head of the list of men wonderfully gifted, He is still on a level merely with Moses, Plato, Aristotle, Confucius—a Master in Israel, and no more. But does Christ stand, in fact, above Mohammed or Moses, for instance, only in being somewhat nearer the truth, and therefore, more reliable? Is His relation to humanity nothing more than the pedagogic work of a schoolmaster? The law was, we are told, a schoolmaster to Christ. But does the grace in Christ Jesus go no deeper, and His mission reach no farther? The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews forever sets aside any such supposition. With him, Christ is not on the same line with the chief of the Jewish prophets, but immeasurably his superior, nay, superior even to the angels—the One perfect, because Personal Revealer of God, "Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *His Son*." If Christianity be no more than a system of truth—its highest reach *as yet*—and Christ no more than its best representative and exponent, then humanity, in its first frail and fallen head, "*dead in trespasses and sins*," is still in a most forlorn condition.

In humanity's actual *deadness*, the need is redemption—life, not doctrine; the incorporated Word, not abstract truth: the LIFE of doctrine, not bare and bald intellectualism. The imperative call was not for more doctrine, nor better doctrine, but a *regenerative Life* in and for humanity; not a better Teacher simply, but a Saviour. Christianity holds not in the letter of the Divine word. It is more than any mere doctrinal statement for the mind; more than a code of morals, or religious maxims for practical life. It is more even than the written word of Revelation. The Bible is not the base, it is simply the

product of Christianity, and entitled to no more regard than the Koran, but for the actual Life of the Incarnate Word back of it. The principle of a thing is necessarily deeper than the thing itself. Back of the verbal Revelation is the essential Principle of Christianity. It was in the world long before the first line of the Gospel was penned. It came into the world with Christ. Christ Himself is the Personal Principle and Very Substance of Christianity; and in its organized form, the Church, the community of regenerate humanity, His life flows down in unbroken continuity, making good through the roll of the centuries His own divine word, "Lo, I AM with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

Over against Humanitarianism, under every form, is this eminent PERSONALNESS of Christ throughout the entire Gospel. Here we have no mere abstractions; but I AMS in marked abundance. It is the unique manner in which Christ is ever heard speaking of Himself. In this, He stands before the world in an attitude at once solitary and sublime. Here, for instance, the truth is seen to be not something abstract—naked maxims, axiomatic principles, systems of philosophy, even the Bible as the revealed word, or what this or that mind makes it. Asked by Pilate, "What is truth?" He expends no time upon its definition. Nor was the royal inquirer, on whose decision the life of the questioned hung, directed to the long line of classic, or yet prophetic sages who had graced the world with their oracular wisdom, but to Himself, and to Himself, not as the medium of the truth—a better Teacher than all besides—but the Truth itself: "Every one that is of the truth heareth MY voice" (St. John xviii. 37). And with this corresponds in full this direct claim of being what no man had ever before pretended to be—*The Personal Truth:* "I AM THE TRUTH."

So in the season of adversity, sorrowing man is not directed for comfort and help to a fellow-mortal. We mock not grief in that rude style. But to the burdened of all ages, Christ is ever saying, "Come unto ME, and I will give you rest." How pretentious and, at the same time, idle for a mere man to use such language! How inevitably would it expose him to ridicule

and contempt! Yet Christ does this, and, so far from shocking men's feelings and provoking mockery with disgust, He strongly draws to Himself their warmest confidence and deepest love.

This Personalness marks yet more strongly what He says about the Resurrection. Like Plato, He does not enter into any proofs in regard of the immortality of the soul. He makes no argument, and gives no doctrine about the resurrection of the dead. He does not more clearly and satisfactorily teach the resurrection, but He goes far enough beyond all this. He claims to be the "Power of an endless life" (*ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου*, (Heb. vii. 16). It is broadly claimed to inhere in His Person: "*I am the Resurrection and the Life.*" "It is in Him personally, as the bearer of our fallen humanity, that death is swallowed up in victory, by the power of that divine life of which He was the Incarnation." Here then, in its deepest sense, Christ's relation to our dead and dying humanity is made to be causative and communicative; and our relation to Him really participative. "*Because I live,*" is His own sublime word, "*ye shall live also.*"

From all this, it is clear that the principle of salvation is not resident in the words of Christ. It is immanent in His Person. Our Saviour is a Divine-human Person—Christ Himself, not a doctrine about Christ. The grand announcement is not, Whosoever believeth My words; but "believeth in Me shall never die" (St. John xi. 26). Hence He showed no anxiety to preserve in a permanent form what He had spoken, thus indicating Himself personally and substantially, and not the truth abstractly taken, to be the world's New Life.

Nor can any single act in the life of Christ separately taken, however central, be particularized as gathering up in itself all the merit of the great atonement. It is common, we have seen, to single out in this way the Cross, and centre in that the whole of the Christian salvation. Doubtless, in type and figure, and at last in sanguinary reality, the Passion and Death of the Saviour are made specially prominent, but not in the way of disparaging and slurring over all that preceded and succeeded that tragic event. The prevenient mystery of the Manger ruled

and determined the significance and merit of the whole. That was in order to all atoning efficacy in His Death, as that itself in turn made way for the crowning event of all—His glorious Resurrection and Ascension.

Thus has the New Head of humanity undone the sad work of the first and fallen. Under the successful probation of this Second Adam, *ὁ Κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* (1 Cor. xv. 47), our ruined race has been redeemed; not merely lifted up to a salvable position, but actually redeemed. He made all things "new." In its profoundest and most real sense, He is the "NEW CREATION," Humanity's Regeneration. Thus, besides being all-comprehensive in its character, redemption in Him, comes to have perennial force; "ONCE FOR ALL" (Heb. x. 10), not in the sense of something exclusively of the distant past—"*once and no more*," a by-gone event, something, therefore, only for memory—but abiding until the last note of time shall sound, "ONCE AND ALWAYS;" "able to save to the *uttermost*" (Heb. vii. 25, *εἰς τὸ παντελὲς—πᾶς* and *τελέω*, *the whole cycle of time, the consummation of all things*), His saving efficacy sweeping through the ages.

But though all are redeemed, all are not saved. Universal redemption is by no means universal salvation. Redemption is the one work of Christ, complete in itself and all-comprehensive; salvation is the individual free and believing appropriation of that great deliverance: "*receiving* the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness" (Rom. v. 17). Organic union with this Headship of regenerate humanity is necessary to a personal participation in the benefits of His one great work. But what is the medium of such a personal participative interest?

Here we close, for the present, with this single anticipative remark, that he who has little or no faith in the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, the supernatural constitution and order of grace, the only form of organic Christianity in the world, can have just as little faith really in Christ Himself, the Personal reheading and summing up, for its redemption, of our ruined Humanity.

Art. II.—THE GERMANS IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY REV. F. K. LEVAN, A.M.

Perhaps the most suitable introduction we can give our subject will be a sketch, so far as the means for it are at command, of the general immigration—of which the Germans form a very large part—to the United States.

Few persons, it may be presumed, have any definite idea of the extent of the emigration from Europe to this country,—few, compared with the mass of our intelligent citizens. Fragmental statistics met here and there, general references made in the public prints of the day, notices of the number of persons arriving at some port, say New York, during a particular week, month or year, and the coming across foreigners wherever one goes throughout the length and breadth of the land; these facts furnish, in the main, what knowledge is commonly at command, and beget the vague notion current among us of the growth and greatness of our foreign element. All this, however, involves much less than the case merits. It is a mere skimming the surface of a sea of deep waters; a mere coasting along the shore of a vast continent. When we cast our eye over the whole scope of this immigration; when we call to mind what a stupendous phenomenon it is; how in extent it compares favorably with, and in character it exceeds, by mankind's advance of a thousand years of Christian civilization, any other on record in the history of the world; that it concerns, intensely and for all time, every civil, social, and religious interest among us: we are astounded at the indefiniteness of our own former views with regard to it, and feel justly surprised that it receives no more intelligent popular attention. Take it in itself and in its manifold bearings on the nation and its future, and on society, literature and the Church, it must be owned a noble study, worthy, in an eminent degree, of the attention of the political economist, the statesman, the philanthropist, the Christian. It is well for

an American to know the history of the founding and growth of ancient states and modern nations. It is better for him to have at his tongue's end the knowledge of the history, growth and composition of his own people, to whom the destiny of a more than imperial domain and its relatively great influence upon mankind have been entrusted. The former he needs not neglect; of the latter he should make himself master.

A subject like this must become intelligible to us through its own facts. Some of them are easy of access and in scientific order; others, scattered, dust-covered, their parts disconnected and valuable portions thereof lost; others, again, simply surviving in the memory of the aged or in the traditions of particular localities. Gathering these together, so far as one may, and bringing them within our ken; arranging them in proper order, and studying their various bearings and relations to the different interests they affect; this will be considering the subject to some purpose, and make our views fruitful for good, while random opinions and venerable prejudices go for little or nothing.

When the country was first colonized it took a century to furnish a population which would now come in three or four years. From 1607, when Virginia was first settled by the English, on through the settlement of the rest of the original colonies; New York and New Jersey in 1614 by the Dutch, New England in 1620 by the Puritans, Delaware in 1627 by the Swedes, Maryland in 1634 by Lord Baltimore, Carolina in 1680 by French Huguenots, Scotch and Germans, Pennsylvania in 1682 by William Penn, and Georgia in 1733 by Gen. Oglethorpe; the growth was slow in the extreme when compared with the present rate, though for the ideas of that period, and under the adverse circumstances, it was rapid withal. The next half century did better in proportion. Increased facilities for transportation, and an improved state of things here, combined to invite those abroad who longed to escape pressing hardships or desired to advance their fortune. The outbreak of the American revolution found a population of 3,000,000. During the 30 years following the establishment of our consti-

tutional government, the influx of immigrants gained considerable in numbers and steadiness. Careful statisticians* estimate —for absolute figures are out of the question at a time when no systematic records were kept—the average annual increase at from 4,000 to 6,000. Some years it was as high as 10,000: during others it sank to from 2,000 to 3,000. The French revolution and the subsequent Napoleonic wars acted as a check.

Much of our earlier history is as little known, and now as hard to get at, as the beginning of the old nations of Europe, which started in barbarism. Perhaps the very diversity of people, who came hither from the first, augmented the indifference, both with respect to the coming of others, and to the written preservation of their own doings. For many a decade the statistics of immigration are not only incomplete, but so fragmental that one feels at great loss what approximate data to assume. Philadelphia, long the chief seaport of the Union and the head rendezvous for immigrants, began the laudable work of recording the names of all passengers who arrived in its harbor. Other ports followed the example. But only since 1819 are we able to furnish the correct number of foreigners who have arrived annually in this country.

For the last few years the immigration has been very great. The close of our civil war, and the opening of rail-road facilities to the Pacific Ocean, have made the United States the country sought above all others; while dislike of the Prussian military system has led the Germans, and hatred of English rule the Irish, to come in unwonted masses. Noteworthy also, as unusual in

---

* Samuel Blodget wrote in 1806, that from the best records and estimates then attainable, the number of immigrants arriving between 1784 and 1794 did not average more than 4,000 per annum.

Dr. Adam Seybert in 1818 wrote in his Statistical Annals of the United States, "Though we admit that 10,000 foreigners may have arrived in the United States in 1794, we cannot allow that an equal number arrived in any preceding or subsequent year until 1817." pp. 28 and 29. He also assumes that 6,000 persons arrived in the United States from foreign countries, in each year from 1790 to 1810.

Kapp makes his estimate from 1784 to 1810 full one-fourth lower than Blodget and Seybert.

former years, is the hegira of the Scandinavians, who exchange the poor, worn-out mountain regions of northern Europe for the fertile plains of our primeval north-west. The present annual immigration to the United States reaches the enormous number of 300,000 souls. The time was when the arrival of two ship loads in New York during the same week created public sensation both on account of the number of the strangers and of the influence it was feared they would exert in their new home. But what were they, compared with the arrivals nowadays?

The immigration from 1819 to 1860 as per census statement was— 5,459,421

From 1860 until now, say— 2,040,579

Or a total of 7,500,000

Estimating the entire population of the United States at present at 41,500,000 the number of immigrants since 1819 would bear to it the ratio of 2 to 11.

The yearly increase of births over deaths appears per statistical tables to be 1.38 per cent. in this country. Mr. C. Schade of Washington has shown that if we take our population at any given date, and increase the number by this per cent. annually to any other date subsequent, and then subtract the result from the actual population at the last date, we obtain the net gain from immigration. In other words, we ascertain what the immigrants and their children have added to what would without them be the sum of the population. We know scarcely a single fact in the whole range of our national statistics of more interest than this. Taking the census of 1790 we have the number of 3,231,930, excluding slaves. Compounding annually by 1.38 per cent., we would have in 1800, a population of 3,706, 674, whereas the census actually figures up 4,412,896, affording a difference of 706,222 as the net gain in consequence of the continued immigration. Applying the same principle we obtain the following table, the first column representing the years in which the census was taken, the second what would be the population compounding it annually at 1.38 per cent., and third, what the census actually makes it to be. To thoughtful

men the figures given will furnish abundant food for reflection.

1800	3,706,674		4,412,896
1810	4,251,143		6,048,450
1820	4,875,600		8,100,056
1830	5,591,775		10,796,077
1840	6,413,161		14,582,008
1850	7,355,423		19,987,563
1860	8,435,882		27,489,662
1865	9,034,245	(Estimated)	31,500,000
1870	9,675,052	"	38,000,000

It appears, hence, that this country owes to immigration since 1790 full 28,000,000 of its present population, or three-fourths of the whole number, excluding the late slave element.

There is a philosophy of emigration as there is a philosophy of history. People leave their native country reluctantly. Kindred, early associations, the fields, hills, valleys, woods and skies, all tend to hold them as with a strong cord. Add to these religion, language, the habits and institutions of the fatherland. When large masses emigrate we may, therefore, feel sure there are pressing causes for it. What are they? We let another answer.

"From the remotest ages down to the present day, from the first Phœnician and Greek colonies, down to the settlement of the North Pacific coast, two principal causes have always induced emigration, and led to the establishment of new states and empires, viz: political or religious oppression and persecution, and social evils, such as want of prosperity, or insecurity, lack of employment, famine and high prices of living in general. In modern times either of these causes has proved powerful enough to produce emigration on a large scale from certain countries. People who are happy and comfortable at home do not emigrate: the poor and oppressed only, who cannot find a fair reward for their labor in the land of their birth, or who feel themselves obstructed or thwarted in their religious or

political aspirations, seek to better their condition by a change of country."*

The statistics with reference to the ebb and flow of the tide of emigration are most curious. For example, one would at first sight expect the emigration to be large right after the Napoleonic wars, and the re-establishment of the old order of things. Europe impoverished and distracted, was bound to the car wheels of absolute government. Surely a time for the masses to leave! But then we must remember that the class of men who emigrate had been thinned, almost beyond precedent, by the ruthless hand of continuous war. The poor had become too poor to go, and those possessed of some means found difficulty in disposing of their property. Then came the great famine of 1816 and 1817, making a bad state of things still worse. And on this side of the Atlantic we had also just passed through a war with Great Britain, which owing to opposition to it in New England and lukewarmness toward it elsewhere, brought the nation little credit, save the lustre reflected from the career of Scott in Canada, Perry on Lake Erie and Jackson at New Orleans. A general financial disarrangement followed. The prospect was uninviting. During this period only a comparatively few thousand immigrants came each year.

Sometimes the very same cause effects a contrary result; in which case we may be sure that strong modifying influences are at work. "While in 1826 of 10,837 immigrants 7,709 came from the United Kingdom, in 1827 their number increased to 11,952 out of 18,875, and in 1828 to 17,840 out of a total of 27,283; but in 1829 their number fell to 10,594 out of 22,530 and in 1830 to 3874 out of 23,322 souls. These fluctuations were due to the great commercial panic of 1826, and the distress in the manufacturing districts of England, as well as the famine in Ireland, which drove thousands from their homes, who, under ordinary circumstances, would never have thought of emigration.

---

* Kapp's Immigration to New York, pp. 5 and 6. This is a valuable work on the subject of which it treats.

"Again in Germany, where the abortive revolutionary movement of 1830 to 1833, the brutal political persecutions by the several state governments, and the reactionary policy of the federal diet, as well as a general distrust of the future, produced an unusually large emigration; in 1831 only 2,395 Germans had arrived in the United States; in 1832, 10,168; in 1833, 6,823; and in 1834 to 1837, the years of the greatest political depression, 17,654, 8,245, 20,139, and 23,036 respectively. The emigration from Ireland, which from 1844 rose much beyond its former proportions, reached its culminating point after the great famine of 1846. During the decade of 1845 to 1854, inclusive, in which period the highest figures ever known in the history of emigration to the United States were reached 1,512,100 Irish left the United Kingdom. . . . . . . With this unprecedentedly large emigration Ireland had exhausted herself. Since 1855 her quota has fallen off to less than one half of the average of the preceding ten years." *Kapp's Immigration*, p. 13.

"Almost coincident in point of time with this mighty exodus from Ireland, was the colossal emigration from Germany, which followed the failure of the political revolutions attempted in 1848 and 1849. Already in 1845 and the following years the German contingent of emigrants to the United States showed an average twice as large as in the same space of time previous to the year named. But a voluntary expatriation on a much larger scale resulted from the final triumph of the political reaction. The *coup d'etat* of Louis Napoleon closed for all Europe the revolutionary era opened in 1848. In the three years preceding that event, the issue of the struggle of the people against political oppression had remained doubtful. But the 2d of December, 1851, having decided the success of the oppressors for a long time to come, the majority of those who felt dissatisfied with the reactionary *regime*, left their homes. The fact that the largest number of Germans ever landed in one year in the United States, came in 1854, showed the complete darkening of the political horizon at the time. The apprehension of a new continental war, which actually broke out a year later in the Crimea, also hastened the steps

of those who sought refuge in this country. People of the well-to-do classes, who had property helped to swell the tide to its extraordinary proportions. From January 1st, 1845, till December 31st, 1854, there arrived 1,226,392 Germans in the United States, 452,943 of whom came in the first five years of this period, and 773,449 in the last five." *Ibid.* p. 14.

By implication we have already intimated that the changing circumstances of this country have also their influence upon the stream of immigration, tending by turns to swell or diminish its volume. Notice by way of illustration the powerful effect on this interest of the commercial panic of 1837. "In 1838 the total immigration decreased to 38,914, while in the previous year it had amounted to 79,340, and in 1839 and 1840 it increased to 68,069 and 84,066 respectively."

So, likewise, the commercial panic of 1857. "In 1858 and 1859 only 78,589 and 79,322 emigrants respectively, arrived in New York; while in 1856 their number amounted to 142,342, and in 1857 to 186,733. In 1860 it rose to 105,162, but in consequence of the breaking out of the civil war, it fell again in 1861 to 65,539, and in 1862 to 76,306. In 1867 the German immigration in New York increased over that of 1866 by more than 10,000, in which last mentioned year it had already reached the large number of 106,716 souls." *Ibid.* p. 15.

It is strange how little influence the Know Nothing madness of 1854–6 exerted upon the immigration. In 1854, 319,223 alien emigrants arrived at the port of New York; among them 176,986 Germans. In 1855 and 1856, the arrivals at the same port were 136,233 and 142,342, respectively. Though these numbers show a large decrease they are still higher than those from 1858 to 1862, during which period the Know Nothing organization had entirely ceased to exist. The decrease had mainly other causes. Looking at the matter in the light of these figures it seems as if the people of Europe had put a truer estimate upon that singular so-called American movement than was generally found here. They kept up *their American movement* in goodly numbers, and, with common sense as an ally in this country, triumphed by their perseverance.

These preliminary observations bring us now naturally to our subject proper, viz: The *Germans* in the United States.

The Teutons are fond of emigration. The earliest notices we have of them show them as given to it. They came into contact with ancient Rome full as soon as Rome came into contact with them. In their own way they pressed forward as much as that proud mistress of the world did. At first the latter checked them; at last they checked it. In their continuous, restless motion we find the chief external cause of the downfall of the Western Empire. Tacitus speaks of them as indigenous* to the soil which was in his day, as it is now, known as their central place of abode. Modern philology has taught us better. We now know them as emigrants themselves from Central Asia; being a branch of what the genius of Frederick Schlegel denominated the Indo-Germanic family, and which Max Müller and other late philologists call the Aryan race. During the Middle Ages they resemble in some respects the great, unquiet sea; on the surface, a heaving mass, and interlining this, and crossing each other, tides and streams in full flow. Thus, nigh half the blood of the neighboring nations became one with their own. For a long time they could be distinguished from those among whom these currents had borne them, as one may betimes the water of one stream flowing into that of another, until by the rise of the separate, definite written languages of these nations, they were permanently cut off from their own parent stem. The same cause, however, gave the German nation also a more fixed character, for the development of its own language was coeval with that of its neighbors. Language and literature make a people homogeneous, and so consolidate it in the only way in which consolidation is compatible with a free normal development. Hence, from the time of which we speak, the German emigration becomes, in many of its characteristics, different from what it had been before. It carries with it more self-possession and

---

* Ipsos Germanos indigenas crediderim, minimeque aliarum gentium adventibus et hospitiis mixtos. De Germania.

individuality, more contents in proportion to numbers, and the varied elements ready at command, for securing the happiness of their bearers and aiding in the advancement of the world, than in former days. This general fact enters into the account with growing influence in forming an estimate of the Germans in the United States.

Among the races, comparatively pure and unmixed, the Germans and Slavonic are by far the most numerous in Europe. The Romanic or Latin race, likewise numerous, embracing the Italians, the French, the Spaniards and the Portuguese may be called a composite of many constituents, with parts thereof also widely differing among themselves. We are here immediately concerned, however, with the numerical strength of the strictly Teutonic element, from which our German immigration has come and will come. A recent statistical work on the German populations of Europe, fixes the entire number of souls at 54,000,000, including German speaking Jews. Forty-nine millions inhabit a compact territory, so that not more than one tenth part of the whole are scattered through non-German states. Foreign races in German-speaking countries number only about 1,240,000, and of these about one-half are in Prussia, where of all sections, they will be the most rapidly absorbed. Considering what the Irish, with an original population of 8,000,000, could do in the way of emigration, how great numbers may not be spared, without even diminishing the home elements, from a people which counts 54,000,000?

Since the modern emigration of individuals and families has taken the place of the old, which went in masses, the Germans may be found almost wherever Europeans go. Open a country for settlement or trade, and they will be among the first to report themselves. They are found in the leading commercial towns of the African coast. The same is the case in Asia. In Palestine* they are becoming so numerous and are gaining in such a rapid ratio as to give rise to the report that their's will eventually

* The statement of the text made the round in our daily papers a few weeks ago. Different German associations are systematically making settlements in the Holy Land. Prominent among these are the "Reichsbrüder," headed by Hoffman.

become the language of the country. Australia counts many thousands of them. Into South America they have flocked in such numbers as to make them a telling element of the population,—especially, too, in view of their superior intelligence and acquired wealth—in all the leading states. Some have gone to Central America and Mexico; very many to British America. But the German emigrant's earthly paradise is the United States. He came early; has continued to come with growing love; and promises to abide by the habit for an indefinite time. He has become nearly everywhere a great factor of our population, and in many places has put himself at the head of it. Do we look for the reason of this preference? We shall find it in the freedom from undue restraint, the absence of governmental interference, which this country has ever offered alike to the colonist and the emigrant. In soil and commercial advantages other countries, as, for instance, Mexico and Brazil, might compete with this, but none has held out the same desirable kind of liberty. On page 16 of his work already quoted, Kapp makes the following just remark. "It is the condition of the success of a colony or settlement that the immigrant relies on his own strength, acts on his own responsibility, and seeks by his own efforts the prosperity which he is sure to find, if undisturbed. All mistakes which he may make, all errors of judgment which he may commit, are of no consequence, if his self-relying spirit is not interfered with. In spite of obstacles and disappointments he will make his way, and ultimately attain his object. . . . He will willingly undergo all the hardships and dangers incidental to a new country, provided he finds a free government and no improper interference with his self-adopted mode of life." To afford these the Latin race seems disinclined, while the Saxon stock glories in it. Hence, also, the different success of the colonies of the two.

The emigration of Germans into the United States may be divided chronologically into two periods, viz: that which took place before 1820, and was confined to the original thirteen states; and that which has taken place since, and has spread over the entire land. The first general formed *settlements*,

properly so called, the people locating in sections by themselves, composing committees of their own nationality, and preserving in many instances permanently, in others for a long time, their own language, habits, type of religion, and whatever marks them as Germans. The latter includes also similar settlements in nearly every state and territory, but has this distinguishing characteristic, that, on account of its great numbers, it has penetrated all communities, and made its own life largely one in common with that of the mass of our people everywhere.

New York has the honor of having the first German colonists settle on its soil. They came with the Dutch, and were almost equally numerous. At that time there was yet much more similarity between the language of the Low-Germans and that of the Dutch than there is now. They had in common the famous dialect known as *Platt-Deutsch*, which Holland has raised into its national language. The most of the German emigrants were from the countries in the neighborhood of Holland; hence having many characteristics in common with its citizens. The assimilation in the new world was, therefore, very easy, and as the Dutch was the language of the government and the Germans then, as ever, readily adapted their names to current pronunciations, it is difficult to get at the correct proportions of population the two nations respectively contributed to the primitive New Amsterdam. The process of the mutual, peaceful, fraternal absorption of the people of different nationalities by each other, now going on all over the land, was inaugurated by the Dutch and the Germans in the early history of New York. The first prominent Director of the colony whom Holland sent over, was Peter Minnewit from Wesel on the Rhine. His history is eventful, and stamps him as a man of character and ability. In 1626 he bought from the Indians the island of Manhattan, on which now stands the great city of New York, for 60 guilders, or 24 dollars in gold. Under his care the colony prospered and the natives were peaceful. He also took a warm interest in the social and religious condition of the people, and was himself an active member and deacon of the Reformed Church.

Another German, Jacob Leissler, from Frankfort on the Main, rose to the position of Governor of the province in 1689. He was a prominent citizen, and public necessity selected him in a stormy period, as the only man from whose authority safety might be expected. Subsequently he fell a victim to unscrupulous political cabals; not, however, until he had done essential service to the community.

The Germans were in large measure the early pioneers of the Empire state. In 1709 a colony of Palatines, under the care of their minister Kocherthal, settled at Neuburg (Newburgh) on the right bank of the Hudson. Higher up the river, and on both sides of it, another colony, consisting of Palatines and Swabians, whose country had been devastated, and who had fled for succor via Holland to England, where the warmest interest was taken in them by queen Anne, her nobility and people, located themselves in 1710. From a list of their settlements, made out in 1718 by the pastors Hæger and Kocherthal, and still preserved, we learn that then already Rheinbeck (Rhinebeck) Esopus and Kingston had been founded. Germantown was one of the first places they settled; so New Paltz. In 1712 and 1713 the first settlement along the Schoharie was made. Here the elder Weiser figured prominently, both in the founding and the establishment of the new colony. In 1722 the Germans bought land along the Mohawk, 24 miles in length, from Little Falls up. As in Schoharie so here, some were from the older settlements, and some new comers. With the increase of their numbers other land was purchased and brought under culture, the outposts were pushed further into the wilderness and on to the heels of the reluctantly retreating red men. About 100 emigrants from Baden came in 1753 to Albany and located the following year at what they called New Durlach, but is now called Sharon Springs.

These primitive Teutonic settlements, which we have hastily outlined, did well their duty in their day and watered with the sweat and blood of their inhabitants the seed of untold blessings for posterity. They did not simply live, grow rich and

die, but met the demands of their situation in the way an heroic people meets them.

On the occasion of laying the corner-stone for the Baron von Steuben monument at Utica lately, Ex-Governor Horatio Seymour expressed himself in the following eloquent language touching this part of our subject.

"In truth, this, the greatest state of our Union, is based upon a population drawn from the countries bordering upon the Rhine. Those of Holland and German descent made up the majority of its population before the revolution. The Mohawk, amid whose tributaries we now meet, *is a German river.*

"Its valley was first settled and cleared by those who spoke the German tongue. From its borders, and those of its confluent, the Schoharie, they went forth to fight the battles of the French and revolutionary wars. No other people upon our continent suffered so much in proportion to their numbers during the revolutionary struggle. Exposed to all the horrors of Indian warfare, it was found when peace was restored, that there was not a home in the Valley of the Mohawk, which had not suffered from the torch of the enemy, or which did not mourn for the dead slain in battle or killed by the ruthless savage, led by Brant or others still more blood-thirsty.

"The most carefully prepared and most formidable attempt to crush American independence was made by the British government in the campaign directed by General Burgoyne. The world looked on and felt that the result would test our ability to uphold our cause. The victory at Saratoga settled the question, and blotted out British rule. It gained us the alliance of France and Spain. By the plan of the campaign, the disciplined armies of England were to march down the Valley of the Upper Hudson. The ships of war were to push their way up the waters of the river above Red Point. The savage allies were to ravage the course of the Mohawk with the torch and tomahawk. All these forces were to meet at Albany, and the control of the state of New York was to shatter the Confederacy by breaking up all intercourse between the northern and southern colonies. Thus divided, we should have been an easy prey to the united forces of Britain. It was

in a dark hour—when the loss of Ticonderoga had cast a deep gloom over the patriot cause—that the battle of Oriskany was fought in the valley beneath us. Disordered at first by the ambush of the enemy, our forces fought with a desperation, which wrung out victory in the end, and forced the enemy to raise the siege of Fort Stanwix and withdraw its forces in confusion and with heavy loss. Thus one part of the combined movement was defeated. The battle of Oriskany was the most fiercely fought, and, in proportion to the numbers engaged, the most bloody and life-destroying of any contest during the Revolution.

"'The men who struggled there for our liberties were of German lineage. The orders given by the stern old warrior,* who directed the fight, despite his mortal wounds, were issued in the German language. The war cries were shouted out in the German tongue, and the dying men uttered their last prayer in the words and accents which have so often gone up from the battle fields of their Fatherland."

The German settlements in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and the old states south, next claim our attention.

---

* General Nicholas Herckheimer. In honor of him both the county and town of Herkimer have since been named.

ART. IV.—ORGANIC THINKING.*

BY REV. D. GANS, D. D.

YOUNG GENTLEMEN:

I am here, at the instance of your call, to deliver what is to pass as an address to literary societies. I trust it is unnecessary for me to say, here at the threshold, that I am not ambitious in regard to the inference which this state of facts might seem to involve, namely, that I am a literary man, and so adapted to the position which I occupy. I make no pretension to such character, nor do I bring any such pretension to the task which has been imposed upon me. Literary societies are always broader and freer than their mere technical name would imply; and it is in the spirit of this broader and this freer idea that I would be regarded as speaking in the bosom of this occasion, on the subject of *Organic Thinking.*

The theme is certainly not one that is uncongenial to the literary atmosphere of this community. It involves perhaps one of the deepest elements, if not *the* deepest, in the College of which you are members. It is the informing soul of your noble philosophy, which has arrested the attention and commanded the profoundest regard of the whole literary world; and your philosophy lies, as it should, in the form of an efficient and plastically moulding power, at the root of all the departments in which the mental energy of the College is expended. Meeting you at your initiation into the Freshman Class, it becomes your guiding-star through all your course, until, placing you upon the very highest summit of the Senior-year, it enables you to survey the whole world of being in the clear light and per-

* Address delivered before the Literary Societies of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., June 28th, 1870.

fect harmony of this one great principle. I am not speaking to you, therefore, in an unknown tongue, nor bringing to your ears foreign and strange sounds, when I speak of the word *organic* in its connection with that of *thinking*. It is, in fact, only seeking to reflect your own familiar image.

Nor are the central and ruling ideas which the subject comprehends limited now, in this country, as they were several decades ago. True philosophic thought has asserted its right and opened its own way. Other literary centres have been feeling the quickening presence of these leading principles, and are waking by the power of them to new worlds of thought and being. The principle of organic thinking carries in it, wherever it spreads, the latent seeds of revolution, which need only the proper mental soil and favorable outward conditions to produce intellectual transformations. No schemes of thought, however old and apparently perfect, if their parts are knit together simply by an arbitrary will, never so ingeniously done, are able to stand before it. In all the changes of systems, from the time that the mind first entered upon its Divine mission of thinking from its own proper nature, has this principle been, without question, the leading and efficient power. The principle itself cannot rest in any scheme of thought that fails to realize its own organic demand, or that does not prove itself to be in full harmony, at every point, with the innate law of thought, in its relation to truth in its own proper objective nature.

Why this constant dissatisfaction with the products of the mind, even the grandest and most beautiful? Why this incessant rising and falling of systems, like the rising and falling of empires and kingdoms, of which they are the bases? We modestly venture what we believe to be the true answer, at least in great part, in these words: because the thinking mind subjectively, has measurably lost its proper relation to the truth objectively, in view of which, however grand and for the time being, attractive and even charming its creations, it requires nevertheless but a brief test in the way of subsequent actual experiment to discover a real want of harmony between them.

History, in this view, becomes a grand and ever-augmenting testimony of man's fall, and yet of his remaining spiritual being; of the fact, that notwithstanding his lapsed condition and carnalized nature, he still lives not by bread alone, but that truth—an eternal and changeless element arising in God, centres also in him, and forms, in fact, the deepest and most essential law of his life. Whence the grating sounds that are heard through all the ages, but from this central and sad disruption of the single and the general, the subjective and the objective? And what is the deeper meaning of all the fierce struggles which have created and rounded the grand epochs of history, but the instinctive and often unconscious yearnings of man's inner nature after the truth?

Here then are two facts, connected with an inference, which we dare not at any point lose sight of, if we would fully see the entire internal as well as outward structure of the question which is before us. The first fact is, that man is a fallen and to that extent a perverted being: the second is, that, notwithstanding this, he nevertheless retains, amid whatever moral ruins, his spiritual being, and is essentially bound to the truth; and the inference is, that, in consequence, the harmony which originally existed and freely reigned between his subjective thinking and the truth objectively has become greatly marred. Thinking, therefore, to be strictly organic, in our present condition, can arise only, under its true form, in the great remedial system of grace, with power to restore this lost harmony; and even then can it attain its own inward accuracy and real perfection, only in proportion as this restoration of harmony becomes historically actual and complete in the general on-going of the world's life.

Organic thinking! What is this as to its nature, conditions and results? This is the question which the subject, ill, or happily chosen, forces upon our attention. Let it not here be thought that we are about falling into the folly of carrying coal to Newcastle. We propose the working-out of no system of mental, moral or natural philosophy. Our purpose is much less complicated and more simple.

The chief glory of man is to think, and the chief glory of thinking is to be obedient to the laws of thought; whilst truth, in its own pure and simple nature, thus reached, is the only satisfactory crowning of the struggle. Man, as the thinking being, stands forth at once in a threefold form, as natural, moral and spiritual; as body, involving the region of sensation, as soul, comprehending the entire department of conscience and ethics, and as spirit, embracing the whole sphere of reason in its own full character, bearing in it the image of the infinite. These arise, not from different centres, as the race, by certain infidel philosophers is supposed to have done, but from one common centre, are pervaded by a common consciousness, and are related to each other in a purely organic way in the bosom of one personality. Organic thinking involves the joint action of these three divisions or parts of our being, each, however, on the ground of its own life and according to its own peculiar law. Each faculty of the mind, such as reason, judgment, memory, imagination and will, considered as a separate power, has its own inherent subordinate law, by which it is, and must be, immediately governed. The mind as such is, however, no more dualistic on this account than is man under the broader view in which we have now presented him. It is a complex whole, and, as such, not many, in the sense of outward mechanical isolation, but one—a real organic unity, involving diversified powers in the bosom of a single life; and in this character, it also has an inherent law. The law here, being more general in its nature and range, is, by necessity, also higher than those which belong simply to individual faculties, and presides over them, giving to each, in the internal genesis of thought, its due influence and force.

This being the character of the mind in itself, we can find no difficulty in perceiving the first necessary condition of what we term organic thinking, thinking, namely, which involves all the intellectual and also moral and natural faculties, but under the law of a common unity. The mind thus thinking, thinks organically. The proper development of this the highest of all organisms, according to the nature of its own laws, superior

and subordinate, so as to open the way for the true, harmonious and free general action of the mind, is the only proper end of education. Even to think of anything beyond this, under the form of profession or business of any kind, is, in the deepest sense, to degrade the mind itself, and the surest way also to disappoint in the end even the partial object which may thus be had in view. Man, as such, is always higher and of more account than any outward calling or uses simply, of a worldly or partial character, to which for the time being he may lend himself; and the best qualification for any separate form of business arises only in the mind developed as a whole, according to its own laws, primarily and prevailingly for its own sake. In this view, the declaration is most emphatically true: "He that seeketh his own life shall lose it."

But the problem of organic thinking is much broader than this. The mind, itself being organic, both in its nature and proper action, must be related in a just way to its object. Here opens the entire world of objective being. What part of this vast domain does not the mind, by an inward necessity, claim as its own? The objective world, furnishing the mind with its necessary outward material of thought, is found to be in strict general harmony with the wonderful constitution of man. It meets him, agreeably to his own nature, first in the form of the physical, second in the form of the moral, and third in the form of the spiritual; although from much of the thinking which now passes current, you might imagine that the last two portions of being had in some way altogether disappeared or become annihilated. Each of these great sides of objective being, as in the case of man, is pervaded by its own laws, which make them separately unique. They do not, however, on this account, constitute three worlds, but only one. Beyond all that appears in the way of difference, whether inward or outward, there is a point of common unity from which all grows forth, which gives the strict nature of organic oneness to the whole. The higher forces in this vast organism are found freely to pervade the lower at every point, imparting to it a richness of intellectual significance, and an æsthetical and

moral beauty which everywhere impress and captivate the mind. Between the physical, moral and spiritual, there is, on this account, no real antagonism. On the other hand, the lower actually demands the pervasive presence of the higher, and neither could at all be what it is, in fact, without such presence. The objective world as a whole, fully harmonious in all its parts, is, therefore, only a fair reflection, the echoing image, of the still more wonderful constitution of man, composed of body, soul and spirit, as this again finds its last ground in the Godhead, in the form of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Man is in this way the microcosm, embodying in the form of condensed essence, all that is comprehended in the vast macrocosm which reigns above and around him.

The relation of the thinking mind to its object as now presented, is not one primarily of clear logical knowledge. This relation holds, in the way of fact, always prior to any such process of the understanding, and constitutes the only condition on which such knowledge becomes a possibility. All reasoning, as such, implies premises or principles already at hand. How are the primary premises or principles obtained? Certainly not by any logical process which might be supposed to precede them, for without them reasoning in the form of logical process is, in the nature of the case, an utter impossibility. Proof or demonstration, in such circumstances, is wholly inconceivable. The relation of the thinking mind with its object, either as a whole or in its parts, is, primarily, not nominal, but real, and consists in the immediate presence to each other of the intelligible object and the intelligent subject, the first, by a similar constitution, authenticating itself to the last, which thus carries in it the exposition of its deepest sense and most hidden mysteries. In this relation lies the ground of natural faith, the prophecy of that which we find in the higher bosom of Christianity; which becomes in turn the primary foundation of all knowledge or science, even the most exact, not only in the order of the natural world, but also in that of the moral and spiritual. It is only as the premises are thus found in the real relation of the mind to its object, prior alto-

gether to any process of the logical understanding, that the reason can be in condition to enter upon its proper work in rearing what is called the grand temple of knowledge, showing in what a general and fundamental sense the formula is true: "I believe in order that I may understand."

It is not meant, by the order in which we have stated the objects of thought, any more than by the order in which we have presented man, namely, the physical, the moral and the spiritual, that this is the true order in which the mind moves organically, in penetrating and acquiring a scientific knowledge of them. Man does not rise up from below, out of the bosom of nonentity, and, beginning with the senses in their relation to the physical world, rise to the moral, and from thence into the spiritual, so as at last, in the way of logical process from beneath, to reach the conception of the infinite—God. Just the opposite order is, without doubt, the true one, in the actual process of organic thinking. Generalization, which is the very nature of thinking itself, is possible only in the *idea* of the infinite, which is comprehended already in the relation which the mind sustains to its object prior to all logical thought of any kind. Whatever illumination subsequent thinking may give to this idea, one thing is clear, that it itself is no product of any such thought. Instead of its being the last result of any such supposed infinite logical process, starting from below, (which is a pure impossibility), it is, in the way of fact, the first premise with which the mind starts from above; and it is only in the general light streaming from this idea, as from a central sun, that the mind is at all able properly to enter the various strata of being downwards, and finally to behold all in its organic harmony with God, its original and essential ground.

Here now the way becomes fully open for organic thinking, but not for its full harmony or scientific accuracy. The premises being given, the mind in its unity, governed by laws inhering in its own nature, enters its complex objection, in its unity, and finds in it laws no less peculiar and essential to its nature, by which the mind is led, step by step, often through the most abstruse labyrinths, until it is brought finally to its ulti-

mate conclusion. When the conditions are all at hand, and the subjective is raised to full harmony with the objective, upon which it is always dependent, you have in the process the grandest movements of which the mind of man is capable, the only true but inferior type of which you find in the precise and accurate, but on their part, blind movements of the heavenly bodies. Truth thus intelligently evolves itself, just as in the case of the bud, from its own secret life, and by means of its own efficient laws. Every step of advance on the part of the mind, strictly along these objective currents of thought, even though the advance appear in the form of bare affirmation or sheer assertion, carries in it the force of the highest mathematical demonstration, for it is the voice of truth itself speaking from its own bosom. It involves the only true principle of argumentation, although it may be entirely free from all the outward machinery of mere syllogistic formulas in their ordinary and secondary uses. As organic, the movement is not in the reflected shadow of the truth simply, but in the truth itself under its original and objective form, which it authenticates immediately, as such, through its own inherent laws. The results of this the highest form of thinking, meet those of the lowest (as the highest and lowest always do—*les extremités se touchent*, namely, the intuitive and instinctive, and carry in them the same irresistible force; and the only difference is, that in the one the truth is fully penetrated by the intelligence and thus fairly evolved for the understanding, whilst in the other, though accurate as the voice of God, it is seized and rested in blindly. Here only is the point at which we reach the true conception of the *scientific*. Everything short of this real organic movement of the mind on the basis of its own nature, in actual harmony with the objective world, whatever may be its pretension in this view, must be regarded rather as a caricature of science than as science in its own high and true nature.

From the vantage ground thus gained, it is not difficult to see how thinking, under this its only true form, may be disturbed, in such way as greatly to vitiate its process, and weak-

en and even entirely invalidate its conclusions. These disturbing forces arise first from the thinking mind itself, and second, from the objective world in which it moves and upon which it rests. When any one faculty of the mind is allowed to break away from its harmonious relation to the other faculties, or to obtain, in any form, an undue preponderating power over them, the consequence is a marring of the mind's harmony as a whole. Confusion is thus brought into the mental constitution, and to the extent in which this is done, will the mind experience an incapacity to follow accurately its own organic laws. The whole action of the mind is, in this way rendered exceedingly narrow and uncertain. It becomes lopsided in its general tone; and thus conditioned, it can only flounder for the most part, where otherwise it might move grandly as a queen amid the rich realm of being. This breaking of the mind's organic equilibrium follows to some extent whatever faculty may thus transcend its proper orbit, and in so doing play the tyrant over the rest, giving as the result, now transcendentalism, then rationalism, and mysticism, and fatalism, and every other ism, on to the end of the chapter on philosophical heresies. But when this disobedience is led by the will, denying its normal relation to the other faculties, and submitting to the control of the feelings and passions, then the case reaches, of course, its most hopeless character. Thinking, in this case, becomes wholly willful, which is the farthest remove from the organic, and can, in the nature of the case, be only in the service of error. Such a mind may indeed be grand in its original gifts and separate faculties, but, like some magnificent works of art in the distant past, it is now grand only in its ruins.

Systems of mere partial or business education, in so far as they develop only some of the faculties to the neglect, if not at the expense, of the rest, carry in them the same confusing and weakening forces. They tend to destroy the organic wholeness and roundness of the mind; to limit its power; to start partial currents at haphazard, which are sure to run into error, and in the end lose themselves, like water poured upon the thirsty earth, and finally bury the man himself beneath the

fragments he has forcibly split from the great trunk of being, with which he had hoped, in this more direct way, to construct a palace wherein he might pass his days in elevated and refined enjoyment. To tear asunder a flower, with the view to make one portion of it to give greater brilliancy and beauty to another portion, is simply to destroy the flower itself. It is to break the law of its organic unity; and the consequence is, that all its parts wilt and fade together. The mind is no less an organic whole than the flower; and just to the extent that its common law of unity is broken, whether directly, by the disturbing power of the will, or indirectly, by a vicious education, which saps the vitality of some, to give greater practicalness of power to other faculties, will the same withering result follow. The thing to be educated is not this or that faculty, but mind—mind in its totality; and not even this in any narrow or exclusive sense, but mind as it involves and means the whole man, body, soul and spirit; and all this on the basis of its own organic unity.

Closely allied with this disturbing force to organic thinking arising from the mind itself, is that coming from the outward objects of thought. Let the objective world be set aside altogether, as the external type and rule of thought, which in many departments is not unfrequently done, and at once the whole principle of organic thinking is entirely abandoned. The mind in this case is left wholly to its own subjective fancies and dreams, which, however, elevated and beautiful in their own nature, are nevertheless, as they must always prove themselves to be in the end, only so many rising vapors, which, after some brief phenomenal changes, speedily vanish away. Here the organic relation between the mind and its proper object is cut; and the consequence is, that the mind, like the ship upon the waves, without pilot or compass, has lost its latitude, and is tending intelligently towards no definite end. But the consequences are hardly less fatal when the objects of thought relatively to themselves are severed and confused, and when only some are sought to be studied and understood, whilst the rest are neglected or treated as though they did not exist. This

is to break for the mind the organic wholeness of the world of being; to imprison it within the limits of a single star, and lose sight of the whole heavens besides; to prevent the possibility of perceiving how one part is conditioned by another; and so to distort and hopelessly to confuse the whole. This is not to educate, but to pervert man. A partial rent in the veil of darkness may at times make apparent things hitherto unseen; and closing again upon the mysteries within, it may leave the mind with a narrow, vague vision; and such vision may occasionally have the power of effecting a transformation in those who are visited by it. It once converted a poor camel-driver into a Mohammed, and a peasant girl tending her goats into a Joan of Arc. So it also made a grand inorganic dreamer of a Swedenborg, and many others, who have found worlds more than God ever framed, and very different. No such partial opening, however, of the veil of darkness, and no such fragmentary conception of the vast complex field of objective being, can suffice to meet the demand of true thinking. It would not do to cut up the sun into as many parts as there are sentient beings that need its light and heat, and assign to each separately its own particular share. No such separate part would meet the want of any such being, nor would all the parts mechanically collected and bound together, do this any more effectually. Each man needs the *whole* sun, that is, its *all* in its *unity*. What is the world of physical nature, the sphere of natural science, separated from the moral world; and what is the moral, the sphere of ethics, severed in like manner from the spiritual; and what is the spiritual, with its richest supernatural glories, in its abstract isolation from the other two spheres? In either case, you would have at best but a sudden rent in the veil of darkness, leaving the mind with fantastic visions. True organic thinking requires the *whole* object of thought, as the only competent guide in each detailed process of the mind.

Still higher must we rise, however, in the way of cautious mental balancing, if we would have all the necessities of organic thinking in full view, and be in condition to actualize it

truly in our own persons. Room must be made, in nature, for that which is not nature on the one hand, and for that which is nature, but rises above it in its common character, on the other. Sin, eventuating in the Fall, with all its consequences, cannot, without essential damage to the true process of thinking itself, be ignored. It is *in* nature, but not *of* nature. It meets us as a fact no less clearly authenticated than any other fact in experimental science. Entering as a foreign power, it has become incorporated with the courses of thought, has modified the whole structure of mind, deeply affected its relation to its proper object, and in a way no less radically has it marred also the harmony that reigned originally in the bosom of the objective world itself. The Apostle's inspiration accords naturally with the deepest philosophy, where, in depicting this general fact, he says: "For we know that the whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now: and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption—the redemption of our bodies." Physical, moral and spiritual nature, comprising in its totality the whole world of thought, as in the case of the mind itself, carries in it no longer the pure hand-writing of God. An enemy's hand has evidently passed over it, rendering exceedingly obscure what was once distinct, and superscribing on rocks, rights and letters many hieroglyphic symbols that did not originally belong to them. Lines of organic thought, which at first involved the only true laws of logic, have now become so faint, that it is only with the most cautious study and greatest labor they can be traced at all. Take the first condition of objective being, and contrast with the same being as now modified by the power of sin, and you have the conditions clearly of two generically different lines of reasoning. Manifestly enough to the most of close students, it is not possible now, at least not to the extent it once was, to conclude, in a strictly *a priori* way, what will be the precise result for the future from any organic laws at present in operation, on the general presumption that these, working organically, must produce in time to come pre-

cisely what they have produced in the past, or that which it was in their nature originally and in a perfectly uniform way, to accomplish. These organic objects, thus entered and materially modified by this great foreign power, must now be examined in detail and concretely, step by step, and in the full, conscious light of the nature of sin in its own character; and even then, no conclusions of the mind can be regarded as certainly scientific, until they are fully sustained by a large number of others of like character produced by the same laws amid the same conditions. It can be very easily seen, in view of facts like these, how the absence of a moral power in the mind capable of properly appreciating the presence and balancing the power of this abnormal force, may serve to vitiate the scientific accuracy of the grandest processes and destroy utterly the ground of confidence in their conclusions.

Besides this, and no less fully authenticated by inductive science, we have the fact, that Nature, even in its normal condition, is always more than Nature simply. This, although science as such may not be able to compass it in such a way as fully to reduce it to the regular laws of natural being, dare yet by science not be ignored. Already on the side of the thinking subject we find faculties, both in the form of reason and will, which, alike in their nature and action, manifestly rise above and transcend the mere finite boundaries of our being in other respects. Reason, as consciousness itself directly proclaims, is the bearer of innate convictions and general principles, which it can find no logical process sufficiently extended to measure; and is, therefore, by its own nature, compelled to receive and believe what it cannot logically understand. Here is clearly an element of the divine in the human, of the supernatural in the natural, which mocks every pretension of mere Rationalism, however imposing it may be in its own nature. So also the will, while it forms a vital part of the general mental and moral organism, is, nevertheless, by its own nature, as will, above and beyond all mere organic laws as such. It is purely autonomic, and is made thus to move grandly from itself above the whole order of nature, presenting one of the severest

problems known to lodge in the entire sphere of philosophy. Here again is seen, in the clearest possible way, the presence of the supernatural in the normally natural, demanding new and increasingly severe conditions in the case of all who would be fully certified at every point, that their thinking is purely and strictly of an organic nature, and therefore, in condition at least to be truly scientific in its results.

But the supernatural which gleams thus manifestly from the mind itself, reigns with perhaps a still more imposing grandeur in the general world of Nature. Everywhere Nature, even by its own constitution, looks through and beyond itself. It enshrines in its deepest being the divine, not indeed as the Pantheist dreams, but still really and truly. It is more than itself merely in any view, in such form that Materialism simply, in its own nature, can never sound or understand it. Every object that primarily appeals to the senses, is found to adumbrate, when by the power of higher thought it is seen in its true organic connection with the whole, the presence of a soul, and in some true sense a conscious spirit also, that is as far above matter simply, as mind is above the material texture of the brain in which it lives. The natural order of being in which our physical life holds, constitutes, on this account, the real bosom of the Parable on the one hand, and of the Miracle on the other, which are the two outward signs of the supernatural, as it reigns invisibly throughout its whole wonderful being. The entire kingdom of Nature answers evidently, in its deepest life, to the higher and purely spiritual world, and demands, in order to the attainment of its own legitimate ends, both as it respects itself and man, its crowning head, to be inwardly apprehended and thoroughly penetrated by this spiritual world at every point of its great being.

With this point now end the leading and essential conditions of organic thinking. Viewed as a whole, with anything like an adequate sense of their full and broad demand, it must appear as sufficiently evident, that he who would aspire to this order of thinking, and be qualified to move freely and surely, amid all perturbations, upon the purely objective lines of truth,

so as to have the conclusions at which he arrives to bear the form of an authentic and authoritative gospel from the bosom of Nature, must himself rise to an exceedingly high position. He must entirely transcend all mere rationalistic limitations of the mind in every view. Reason must be allowed, without let or bar of any kind, to fill freely its broadest and highest sphere. And will it then be able to grasp objective being in its totality, in such a way as to be able to bring it fully within the mental laboratory, and so as to develop, amid all its distant and immediate, its latent and active conditioning forces, the great principles which permeate it? The question answers itself in the higher conscious being of each, with a decided negative. Mind rests not in itself; neither can its true action, in any form, find its satisfactory basis on any plane thus low and uncertain. The reason, even in its most perfect organization in the bosom of all the mental faculties, if it move simply in its own natural sphere, is, at best, in this view, like the eagle that would soar to the sun, but finds itself, when too high to descend gracefully, incompetent to continue its flight and thus consummate its purpose. Revelation becomes thus an absolute necessity to all true thought. Mind and its object meet organically, now, in their true form, only in the broad bosom of Christianity, which is a new creation in the heart of the old, meeting in a remedial way the perturbations of sin on the one side, and giving to the normally supernatural in its union with the natural its true scientific expression on the other. Beyond the physical centre of the natural order of being lying in the material sun, there is a still deeper, and broader, and higher centre of the whole of being, physical, moral and spiritual, in the Person of Christ. Here alone do the natural and the supernatural come to their true harmony. At no point lower than this can the mind be in true condition to enter organically the great lines of thought as these spread from their own common centre, as thus found; and by no inferior power to that which emanates from the mind of this great Prophet of Nature, can the human reason become qualified to travel on these lines, so as to arrive, in a sure way, at their own rich, high and full final results.

Organic thinking, moving thus in the broad bosom of Christianity and led by the Christian faith, as this completes the natural, which we have already seen to lie at the threshold of all knowledge, is, as we shall find no difficulty in perceiving, the essential demand of all departments of thought. What is Science in the order of physical nature, for instance, with all its pretensions, poised on any lower plane? What, for the most part, but Nature killed and eviscerated, in such form as to make it only a wretched caricature of its own proper and glorious self? The numerous variations and endless contradictions which it carries in its own bosom, are enough to show, beyond all question, that it is moving below its proper plane and outside of its true orbit, and that it can never thus reach the whole truth, nor any part of it in its own full nature and truthful relations. Here lies the prolific womb of all those monstrous heresies, which often pass as great scientific truths, by which it is sought to rule God out of His own world and bury the hopes of men in a common materialistic grave. But nature thus inwardly dissevered and outwardly compressed and actually killed cannot be taken for the free and living work of God. Nature, evolved from its own full life, replete with its rich mystery commanding the reverence of faith, budding forth at every point the concentred forces of its pure spiritual essence, and crowned with the ripened fruit of its own substantial life, nourishing the Divine in man, giving him aspirations to a kingdom beyond itself, is the only form of science that can meet the demand of organic thinking, or in any real way satisfy science itself in its own true form; and between such living science, or science fully corresponding with its living object, and the Bible, evolved in like manner from its own base, the living Person of Christ, there can never be found the presence of a real conflict.

In the sphere of Philosophy, mental and moral, what but strict organic thinking, as brought in the Person of Christ to its only true and adequate plane, can be of real service? The various systems, ancient and modern, starting on a lower ground, and following a different process, are all felt to have

measurably failed in their great work; and as failures they have passed away. They all started at some point outside of the great centre of truth in its wholeness, and found it impossible, on this account, to complete themselves in true scientific form, or do full justice to truth in its manifoldness, or on all its sides. They are, in this view, necessarily fragmentary; and so badly have some of them perverted these fragments of the truth, as to turn them almost wholly into the service of error. Many of them, indeed, carry in them splendid specimens of organic thinking on narrow principles in isolated detail; but, failing to start in the proper centre, which alone can give the right character, tone and fulness to details, they fell below the true demand of thought under this form, and came radically short even where they were supposed to be most complete. Philosophy—than which there is no department more grand, and certainly none more far-reaching and general, starts in the organic centre of intellectual and moral being under its objective form; and passing from thence upon its great currents of thought, it is governed throughout, and necessarily, by faith no less than by logic, both in its process and conclusions. The result is a system that has heart in it, as well as brain, life, as well as form, that which towers above the reason but yet belongs essentially to man, as well as that which may be compressed at all points within the contracted circle simply of the logical understanding.

And what, wholly on the outside of organic thinking, is History? Just what we find much, perhaps the greater part of it, to be in fact, the external representation of the subjective fancy of the historian, ruled for the most part, either by his political prejudices or his personal passions, or at best, a system of dead facts, in no way inwardly related either to themselves or to the circumstances which occasioned them. In no sense can history, in this view, come to be anything like a real objective movement in the life of the world itself, organically united to its original scheme, intellectually, morally and politically, bearing in its bosom to each subsequent age the true significance of the past. It grows from no inward and necessary

unity; and much less is any real Divine factor allowed to pervade its parts, so as to secure to them an intelligent and consistent meaning. Without objective consistency, History becomes the merest play-ground of reckless forces, a chaos of confused powers, a dark void in human existence, or a tidal flow and ebb of dashing torrents, each independent of the other, the last never extending beyond the first, involving neither instruction for the single mind, nor advance for the general life of the world. Such conception of history lacks the genius of organic thinking, which has shed the beams of an entirely new light, in our own age, over this vast and interesting region. This has discovered a power behind the throne greater than the throne itself. It has seen in the movement of the ages the evolution of a grand scheme on the basis of its own objective laws, and in full harmony with itself and the great interests of humanity. It hears from its bosom more than the voice of the historian—more than the voice of the age—the voice of God as well. Through the wreck and ruin of old dynasties and systems, it mounts to higher planes, and carries the life of the world forward at every step with a steadiness of purpose, in the bosom of a concurrent unity of forces, and withal by an inward and free necessity, that commands at once the deepest and most devout reverence of the mind.

We need hardly say that organic thinking is no less vitally connected with all Theology that is really deserving of its name. What is the value of this, even in its best character, when it results simply from willful subjective notions, without regard to its own objective world? What is the truth in this form, at any point, and how shall it be surely ascertained and generally known? Why the endless contradictions which crowd this department? Is it not because its central objective fact is not perceived as such, or because no care is had to reason organically from this centre on its own lines? No mere *doctrine* as such, however significant and weighty it may be, can be sufficient to answer the demands of scientific theology. Schemes of this character, replete with the finest genius and most consummate learning, each discarded and abandoned in

its turn, are found scattered, like the sapless rubbish of the forest, through every part of this vast region. They answer as a whole neither to the true thinking of the mind nor the true believing of the heart; and for the reason prevailingly, either that they have not embodied the true, central object of theological thinking, or have failed to follow this organically to its own legitimate ends. In this way, they have not only failed to bear the great central fact itself to the reflection and faith of the mind in its own living and wondrous character, but also even its correct image or truthful report. Theology, as a system, requires organic thinking no less really than science, history or philosophy. As well might we dream of constructing a system of Astronomy without regard to the objective heavens, or a scheme of Geology independently of the strata or rocks of the earth, as to form a Theology without regard to its own objective world. Organic thinking can alone dissipate the subjective fog which has condensed and obscured the theological firmament, and again bring forth its true central object, as this holds in the Sun of Righteousness. Here, in the brief formula—*θεος ἐστι ἐν Χριστῶ, κοσμον καταλλασσων ἑαυτῶ*, is the only adequate ground for science in this view, involving not a doctrine merely, however, central even and true, but a living fact, a living personal fact, Christ Himself, comprehending, on His human side, the whole world of Nature, and on His Divine side, the whole world of Spirit, both uniting vitally in His one personality. From this common centre the way opens for the mind to move organically along the currents of the surest objective verity in both directions, upwards and downwards, and to fix the truth at every point in the most exact and certain form. All theology, to be truly scientific, and thus be able to authenticate itself to the intellectual nature of man, must, by its own necessities, begin with this objective Christological centre—this last source of all revelation, whether of the nature of God or of man, or whether of the revelation which holds between them. Theology, in this view, is not only a science strictly so called, standing on a level with many others around it, but it is the science of all sciences which are in any true

way deserving of the name. It involves the general necessity resting upon organic thought to trace all the sciences from one common centre of objective being, which is, therefore, the theanthropic or mediatorial Person of Christ, and to study and understand each as it is related to and modified by others, and thus rise to the conception of the whole in its true nature and perfect harmony. Destroy for the mind this Christological centre of unity, and with it the power of organic thinking, and it is not difficult to see that the whole world of thought is at once hopelessly disrupted; that each department is isolated and independent; that the necessities are at hand for endless confusion and contradiction; and that the result at last must be a general absence of faith everywhere and in regard to everything.

True Art, no less than true science or philosophy, is also dependent in the same absolute way, on organic thinking. The imagination is no reckless faculty floundering in the dark, without law or guide. It accomplishes its work properly only in organic harmony with the other powers of the mind. Even in its grandest ideal creations, whether in Poetry, Painting, Sculpture or Music, it moves strictly on the line of its own true organic law; and, therefore, it is that these grand creations, though purely ideal in their nature, meet and appeal nevertheless to our higher consciousness, as does our own well-known reflected image. Thus Architecture is made to take on, almost as by growth, its legitimate form, and to embody its distinctive living spirit. It becomes the organic body, in the sphere of Art, of the ideal soul. The world of Romance, including all its species, as bounded, furnished and peopled by such a mind, for instance, as that of Shakspeare's, moving all the while along the real currents of life and history, is never ideal in the sense of being unreal. Actual men meet their own image in every character that is brought upon the stage, while they realize themselves to be moving perpetually through all the complicated net-work which is so perfectly woven in his scenes. Outside of organic thinking, all this would be to the eye like the tawdry dress of the harlequin, or to the ear like the confused

medley of discordant sounds, which find their echo neither in the heavens above, nor in the earth beneath, nor yet in the waters under the earth.

It would be unnecessary, in view of the extent to which the subject of organic thinking has already been carried, to trace its relation, in any minute way, with society under its practical form. Here, whether it concern the problems arising from the Family, the State or the Church—whether it regard law, government, education, business, morality or religion, or whether it refer to the relation of these to each other in the bosom of a complex whole, organic thinking is, as all can readily see, of the most central and vital importance. Society itself can clearly no otherwise be understood. It is the bosom of all sound legislation and the true genius of all wise statesmanship. Whence for the most the vagaries, such as Fourierism and Libertinism, that have abounded in the bosom of practical society in the different periods of the world's life, but from the absence of this true law of thought, by which the mind becomes incompetent to trace out the several spheres in society under their own objective character, and to perceive clearly, beyond all phenomenal differences, a real and common unity of basis and life? Only as society comes to be seen in its own strictly organic character, can room be made properly for the legitimate function of each of its great factors, so as to secure a true united result. Thus it will be perceived, that the Family, the State and the Church, being each essential in the complex whole, that the legitimate rights of neither can be in the least degree invaded by the rest, without bringing moral confusion and material damage into the entire life of society; that the Church and State are not sundered in such form that there can be no mutual coöperation between them looking to a common end; that there is no reason why the State should assume the whole work of education, separating it thus necessarily from all religion and giving to it a wholly godless character; and also that there is, and can be no justification on the part of the State for forcibly and arbitrarily taking from the Church, and even from God Himself, the subject of Marriage in its true

spiritual and Divine character, and by granting divorces, affect to do what God alone can really do, thus disrupting society in its deepest life. Plainly the absence of organic thinking is the presence of all warring and destroying antagonisms; and its presence, moving from the true centre, is, as it must be, in like manner, the only adequate promise and pledge of actual harmony and certain prosperity.*

It is not difficult to see, at this stage of the general subject, that organic thinking, from this common Christological centre, comprehends in its own range all the essential spheres of thought. It demands the *whole* at every point, as the necessary condition of properly understanding the *all*, or any of the parts that enter into and fill out the all. The educational actualization of this system gives us the school in the form of the *University*, in which the same mind is educated from a common centre in all the necessary and legitimate departments of being. The University is the necessary culmination of organic thinking. No need for this country, with its interminable diversities of activity, can be well conceived of as being more vitally important. What else can elevate its general mind and give it a free inward correspondence with its vast geographical breadth; unite the varied interests of all its parts in one grand whole, and so equalize the centripetal and centrifugal forces, which by necessity are constantly active, each tending to overcome and enslave the other; and open the way, amid all the intellectual, moral and religious segments into which our life

---

* In all these respects, we may apply the words of Wordsworth:

> Inquire of ancient wisdom; go, demand,
> Of mighty Nature, if 't was ever meant
> That we should pry far off, yet be unraised;
> That we should pore, and dwindle as we pore,
> Viewing all objects unremittingly
> In disconnection, dead and spiritless;
> And still dividing and dividing still,
> Break down all grandeur, still unsatisfied
> With the perverse attempt, while littleness
> May yet become more little; waging thus
> An impious warfare with the very life
> Of our souls.

has been split, and by which it is now narrowly bounded, for the full reign of a common Catholic nationality?

This ground for the University in its true character has been laid and dug already by the philosophy of Franklin and Marshall College. Not only does this philosophy lay thus the foundation of the University, but necessitates also, in an inward way, its actual superstructure, as its only fitting outward body. We claim this honor for Lancaster. Nor will it, when it comes to take actual shape, pattern after anything of the same general character in Europe. The Christological centre of being which has become the soul of the philosophy that must necessarily mould its life and govern its form, will place it beyond anything that is yet known in the old world. Many of the universities of Europe are noble, but this will be more noble. The picture looks down upon us we hope not from afar. Youthful and beautiful and yet in her intellectual glory, as Franklin and Marshall College is, with her children grown into manhood, power and distinction around her, what shall hinder the consummation of a purpose which arises so necessarily from her own mental and moral being, and which is so essentially connected with our common life in all its forms? As Alumni of the College, we are waiting with restive patience, this grand enlargement of our intellectual home; and you, Young Gentlemen, after you shall have passed from under the parental roof, and mingled with the narrow sectarianisms, or mental bigotries of the day, will be delighted to return and find your *Alma Mater* in a condition to mitigate all asperities and lead the mind of future generations to truth under its whole, broad, high and harmonious character. Organic thinking, in this view, can be satisfied only as it actualizes itself in a living educational or institutional system, with full facilities to give it real working effect, or in our case, as it sees the goodly City of Lancaster passing under the bright shadow of Franklin and Marshall University.

ANNO DOMINI, 79.

BY JAMES L. FERRIERE, M. A., PHILADELPHIA.

When during our school and college days we conned the pages of the old Roman historians, poets, and philosophers, did we ever truly realize, that they, whose immortal writings we were studying, had once really lived and died, had experienced the tender emotions of love and friendship, and endured human pains, sorrows, and disappointments? When in those writings we studied their religion, with its airy and fantastic legends of naiad and nymph, of god, hero and demi-god, in which the mortal and the immortal, the human and the divine, seemed to meet and to blend into one, did we ever realize how that religion, far from being the mere creation of poetic fancy, had once been the faith of millions of our fellow-men? To realize such thoughts is indeed difficult for us who are living in this seeming noonday of civilization, and in a land as yet in the first flush of youthful vigor, still such a realization is not impossible. Across the wide Atlantic lies the land where those millions once lived, and in that land is to be found one of their cities so marvelously preserved with all the traces of their public and private life so fresh upon it, that we are at once carried back, and placed in the midst of the old Roman life, just as it existed eighteen-hundred years ago.

Leaving behind Naples, with its mingling modern and mediæval life and population, a three hours' drive brings you to the entrance of Pompeii; a few steps down an inclined plane and the Nineteenth Century is shut out—eighteen hundred years are wiped away and you are in the midst of the 79th year of the Christian Era. The city it is true is in ruins, but the ruins are not such as are wrought by the hands of time.

Vesuvius in burying Pompeii has but preserved it, its temples still stand dedicated to the worship of the old gods; the streets still retain the footprints of the crowds that once thronged them, and at every step is revealed some secret of the public and private life of its inhabitants. It is the greatest victory ever gained over time—it is as though the vast chasm of eighteen centuries were bridged and the old world and its civilization brought face to face with the new.

Evidently you are in its business centre. Here is the Forum, the pillars that supported the gallery that surrounded three sides of its open square are still standing and its pavement still shows the wear and tear of the sandals of the citizens who in those old days congregated within its inclosure. At yonder end opens the temple of Venus with her altar still standing before the shrine; on the right is the Commercial Exchange, where the merchants came to bargain with each other, and where you notice their calculations, scratched on the frescoed walls, looking as though only done yesterday; and on the left is the Market House whose walls are beautifully frescoed with representations of birds, fruits and flowers. Crossing the street that runs along the southern side of the Forum you enter the Hall of Justice—a large room, whose walls are covered with those scribblings by which in all ages and among all nations "the people" assert their title to public buildings. Here some one proclaims that "Oppius the porter is a thief and a liar," and the scratches that nearly deface the libel show how poor Oppius resented the slanderous charge, and, here some impatient petitioner for justice satirizes the law's delays. With what freshness does the fragrance of the "old, old story" come wafted through the distance of eighteen centuries as you read.

> "Scribenti mî dictat Amor monstratque Cupido
> Ah! peream sine te si Deus esse velim."

How you thrill as you recognize passages from Virgil and Ovid among these rude scrawls, sometimes used with a personal or political application, and how near are brought the days

when their writings were part of a household literature, just as those of Tennyson and Longfellow are of ours. With such revelations concerning the old inhabitants of the city, it is not difficult to re-people that hall of justice—between those two Corinthian pillars, sit the *Duumviri* in their stone chairs, before them stands the accused, anxiously watching whether any impression in his favor is being made by the eloquence of his advocate, whose voice still seems to linger around those old walls. Here crowd the spectators, and there is the lover confiding his tender secret to the wall, little dreaming how, centuries after that secret will be read and understood by wanderers from lands to him unknown. You pass out into the narrow street and the phantom throng is there also. The merchant brushes by you as he hurries to the Exchange, behind you resounds the stately tread of a Senator wending his way to the forum, through the busy hum of life ever sounds in your ears the sonorous music of the old Latin tongue and all around this group of public buildings there seems to linger a breath of the Eternal City and a golden shadow of Roman splendor.

The streets, few of which are twenty-five feet wide, are paved with irregular squares of lava, in which you notice the deep ruts worn by the cart wheels that rolled over them eighteen centuries ago. The high narrow sidewalks are of slabs of the same material, and at the crossings huge blocks form convenient stepping-stones across the water that during the rainy months swept in torrents through them. The houses that line the two sides of these streets are mostly of two stories; and the lower stories are generally occupied by shops whose counters open right on the street, and behind which the owners would stand loudly proclaiming the excellence of their wares. Over some of the shops are sculptured signs, and in some even relics of the stock in trade. This one is a barber's, whose master may have shaved the chin of Cicero. This carved serpent the emblem of Æsculapius announces the chemist's, and a step or two further is the surgeon's, where were found some three hundred surgical instruments, some of which show how many an invention of modern science was anticipated by the

ancients. This is the studio of a sculptor, with the unfinished statue bearing the trace of the last touch of the artist's chisel, and here is a wine merchant, among whose big-bellied Amphoræ there seems to linger the fragrance of Falernian and Calabrian vintage, and whose marble counter still bears the wine stains left by the tipplers of other days. This is the bakery—the dough-troughs and grinding mills stand just as the owner left them, and in the oven are the loaves of bread, baked to cinder by the baking of eighteen centuries. At the street corners, marble slabs let into the walls, bear painted in long narrow letters the advertisements of the day. How strange to see it announced that "to-morrow thirty pairs of gladiators will fight in the arena," or to read of a lost jar of old wine for the recovery of which Varius offers a reward and promises a double reward for the capture of the thief. From the number of "political posters," it would seem that Pompeii was buried on the eve of an election. Here a trades union "unanimously nominate Pausa for the office of Ædile," and here "Valentinus and his pupils nominate Rufus." Sometimes a candidate is recommended as a "good man," or an "excellent citizen" or a "very moral young man;" and even our politicians may learn a lesson from the delicate force of one that promises the electors that if they elect Sabinus, he will appoint them to office. How all this brings back the teeming life of other days, making the past live again in all its active reality! The shops again throng with customers. You hear as you pass along the witty-tongued barber pouring his little fund of anecdote and gossip into his patron's ears. From the windows and overhanging balconies peep dark eyes, and you catch a glimpse of flowing tresses, or of taper fingers that touched red lips in response to the kiss thrown to them by the gallant half hid in the angle of yonder wall.

Passing through a gate whose inscription announces that the road beyond leads to Herculaneum, you find that this is part of the famous Appian Road that traverses the empire from north to south, and as you stroll along it, you discover that you are in the cemetery of the city. The ancients did

not love death, and avoiding even the mention of the word were constantly endeavoring to deprive it of its terrors. The bodies of the dead were burned with ceremonious pomp and magnificence, and their ashes were collected in graceful urns, which were placed in the niches of fantastic little temples reared along the roadsides, among which the good citizens would stroll in the quiet summer evenings, and the children join in their merry games of romping sport. On these temples are inscribed the names and virtues of those in whose honor they were erected, and many of them richly decorated with sculpture, fresco and mosaic, are perfect gems of Roman art. But what a sad feeling comes over your Christian heart, as you notice among these monuments and mortuary inscriptions, the total absence of any token of a knowledge of that life that lies beyond the grave, and that for you has so much of comfort and of meaning. To the pagan Roman death was the end of existence, the Elysian fields of his spirit land were at best but the abodes of a dreamy, unconscious and self-forgetful state—his belief is embodied in yonder sculptured representation of a weeping woman holding an inverted and extinguished torch —in vain you seek among those gay little temples for some of those holy and loving words that have brought calm and comfort to many a bereaved and aching heart, and you turn sadly away, but with an humble gratitude for the priceless hope that has been given to you in Christ and His holy religion.

You now re-enter the city, whose whole life lies spread out before you. Would you see the vices of its inhabitants? here they are in all their devilish hideousness. Yonder is the brothel, flaunting its indecent sign in the broad glare of day, and on its unhallowed walls you find depicted the disgusting scenes of a sensual mythology, in which the divine nature is lowered to the level of the human, and both are dragged through the filth and mire of licentious immorality—but *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*—let us turn away from these sad scenes of human frailty, which however are not without their lessons, for in them you will find ample proof that Christianity has purified the world and elevated the standard of human morality,

and that men, aye and women too, are nobler and purer to-day than they were eighteen centuries ago—but when you have learned this lesson, turn aside in charity from this ghastly revelation of the vices of the old Roman world.

The scenes of domestic life lie open before you. You enter the deserted houses and gaze undisturbed on their frescoed walls and mosaic floors. They all seem to be built on a similar plan, and only to differ in size and magnificence of decoration. Through a gate over which is the owner's name, and a vestibule on whose pavement is inscribed the word *Salve*, you enter an open square court yard. Around its four sides is a shed roof of tiles supported by columns; it is paved with flag stones, marble or mosaic according to the means of the owner, and in the centre is a well or perhaps a fountain. This is called the *Atrium*, and around it are arranged the more public rooms of the house. A sort of antechamber leads you into another similar though smaller court. This is the *peristylum*. It is more richly decorated than the *Atrium*, the pillars are more slender and graceful; finer frescoes adorn the walls and more delicate mosaics cover the floor; a gay little flower bed and a tiny fountain whose spray sparkles in the sun-light occupy the centre, and here and there are scattered bronze and marble statues. This is the domestic portion of the house, and into this *peristylum* open its private rooms, whose entrances instead of doors had simply curtains. The little rooms on the right and left are the *cubiculæ* or bed chambers; at the further end is the *tablinum*, a sort of a reception room, decorated with wax effigies of the ancestors; on one side of this is the *larium*, or family chapel, and on the other side is the library, in some of which you find the rolls of papyrus which though burnt to charcoal still retain their form, and on some of which can still be traced the letters with which they were inscribed; in yonder angle is the triclinium, or banquet room, with its three-sided table around which the host and his guests reclined on couches during the repast, and through this you pass out into the little garden in the rear of the house, which was always filled with gay and fragrant flowers. The frescoes and mosaics on the

walls and floors of these houses represent the scenes of history or the stories of Religion, and that Religion meets you on these walls and floors as it never did in the books you have studied. Jove, Venus and Pluto are there depicted in all the radiance of the days when men knelt before their shrines and feared their power, and the scenes of mythology and of history live on these walls in beauty unfaded by the lapse of centuries. In one house you find the whole story of the Iliad depicted in frescoes, whose colors seem as though they had but just left the artist's pallet, and in another is a mosaic representing the battle of Issus—Alexander galloping at the head of his Macedonian phalanx has just struck down the Persian general; Darius seems to forget his danger in the anguish of defeat, and stretches his hands towards his fallen commander, while his fleeing army leave him to the mercy of the conqueror. The whole scene—the victorious onslaught of the Macedonians—the mad confusion of the routed Persians, the flush of pride on the face of Alexander and the anguish and shame on that of Darius leave on you that vivid and lasting impression that a true masterpiece in art must leave—and all this wondrous work of art is but the mosaic pavement of a room!

Here comes out to view the æsthetic difference between the ancients and ourselves. With us Art is almost always the superfluous, something cast upon us from without, and rarely entering more than skin deep into our life, but with the people in the midst of whose life you are standing, art and æsthetic culture seem to have been one of the conditions upon which their intellectual life depended. Penetrating deep down to the very fountains of their being and blending harmoniously with their religion, æsthetic culture was a constituent part of every phase and feature of their life. To them the real and the ideal seems to have had no separate existence—art entered everywhere, brightening, vivifying and perfuming everything.

In all these houses still seems to linger the presence of those who once inhabited them, and so real and vivid is the sense of that presence that sometimes you even feel as though the owners were only temporarily absent, and you almost fear

to linger lest they should return and resent your intrusion into their privacy.

In continuing your wanderings through the city, you pause to examine its two theaters, but the drama was no Roman institution, and was almost unknown in Roman literature—the amphitheater extinguishes the theater. The amphitheater stands in the eastern angle of the city's walls. A long vaulted passage brings you to the arena, which is dug down deep in the heart of the hill in which the amphitheater rests. From the arena, in ever-winding elliptic circles rise tier above tier the seats of twenty thousand spectators; these seats are divided into three sets; the first and lowest is the *podium*, reserved for the senators, priests and aristocracy of the city; the second is for the citizens, and the third and uppermost is for the plebeians, while yonder corner is set apart for strangers. Im some of the houses you have visited are frescoes representing this amphitheater when filled with the crowds of festival days, and as you seat yourself in the stranger's corner, in imagination you see the vast structure beginning to fill up as it did on the morning of that 23d day of November at whose close the city entered upon its long sleep.

The morning sun has just tinged with gold the cloud that hangs over the summit of distant Vesuvius. The crowd is fast assembling, and now the Quæstor gives the signal for the opening of the games. First are combats between wild beasts, succeeded by combats between men and beasts, but eager for a deeper excitement the crowd is already calling for the gladiators, who now make their appearance. First a single pair step into the ring—their scanty clothing reveals the swelling muscles of leg, breast and arm; loud applause greet them as they make their salute to the spectators, personal friends, addressing them by name, call out encouragement, and wagers are offered and accepted. Now crossing their short swords they begin the combat. Standing knee to knee they hew and hack at each other, while the spectators watch in breathless expectation and greet with murmurs of applause each skillful blow; suddenly the red life-stream gushes from a deep gash in the side of one

of the combatants, and loud cries of "*habet, habet,*" break from the spectators. The wounded gladiator endeavouring to staunch his wound with one hand extends the other with the thumb pointing downwards, towards the spectators, as a token that he begs for mercy at their hands, but, his appeal is unanswered, and with stoical resignation he submits to the death blow. Another, and another combat follows in quick succession. Sometimes one of the strong-minded women of the day, eager, like some of her modern sisters, to unsex herself, may be seen entering the arena and contending for the bloody prize. Now whole bands of gladiators mingle in headlong strife, until but one mangled and bleeding survivor remains to receive the admiring plaudits of the crowd, among which, are matrons and young maidens looking with unblanched faces upon the scene of carnage. Ah the Roman nature had no need of the drama's mimicry of passion and of death so long as it possessed such gross realities in their cruel and bloody games.

But a sulphurous cloud, growing darker and heavier each moment, is covering the face of heaven; through it the beams of the noonday sun, falling in lurid splendor, illumine the upturned faces of the astonished spectators. All eyes turn in terror to the distant mountain whose summit is hid beneath a dark cloud of smoke—now comes a crash and a red glare as the mountain begins to vomit forth its red waves of melted lava. "*Vesuvius is on fire!*" rings from twenty thousand blanched lips, and the whole of that vast multitude join in mad flight. Ah what scenes must have then transpired. As you sit in that desolate amphitheater, imagination may perhaps recall the scene, but pen and tongue must ever fail in the attempt to describe it.

A few years ago those engaged in excavating the ruins came upon a spot where the ashes in hardening seemed to have retained the impression of the human form, and in the cavities thus formed skeletons were noticed. Liquid plaster was poured into these strange moulds, and thus were obtained casts of four of the citizens who perished in that awful catastrophe. These casts are still to be seen, and they tell the story of that 23d of November in all its awful reality. The plaster had replaced

the flesh on the skeleton, and, to a certain extent, has even reproduced the garments worn during life. There exists nowhere anything similar to these relics of mortality. Egyptian mummies, black and hideous, have nothing about them that is common to humanity, but these Pompeians are our fellow-men, struggling in their death throes before our very eyes. You see them in that supreme moment of existence when the last wave of the tide of life had ebbed, and they lie before you with every mark of the great agony of death stamped upon them.

The first is a young woman; her hands are so convulsively clenched that the nails seem to pierce into the flesh; over the whole body can be traced the muscular contortions of agony, and you realize how terrible her sufferings must have been—the whole attitude is not that of death but of agony. Next to her lies an old woman—she also has suffered terribly, as the contorted limbs and clenched teeth and hands show. Beside her lies a young girl, who could hardly have been fifteen years old; how accurately even the texture of her garments and all their pleats and folds are reproduced in the plaster, while here and there a rent leaves bare the smooth skin of shoulders and arm; one little hand presses her vail over her face to shut out the hot ashes that are stifling her, and the other supports her head—she has fallen on her face, and does not seem to have suffered much, but it makes your heart bleed to look at her. The last lies by himself—a man of colossal frame, and in all the vigor of manhood; he has stretched himself on his back and composed his limbs to die bravely, and there is a noble and soldierly resolution about him as he thus fearlessly faces death. There is about these plaster casts something that the sculptor's chisel has never produced—place beside them the Laocoon, with all its marvellous mimicry of human agony, and it sinks into insignificance before their awful reality.

Let us pause here—Pompeii has naught within its walls that would not jar on us and appear weak and trifling after this exhibition of death in all its horrors, revealed to our eyes after the lapse of eighteen centuries

Art. V.—THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF REALISM IN ITS BEARING ON THEOLOGY.*

The religions of the ancient world, says Dr. Cocker, in his recent work on Christianity and Greek Philosophy, were the painful effort of the human spirit to return to its true rest and center—to find Him who is so intimately near to every human heart, and who has never ceased to be the want of the human race. The philosophies of the ancient world, says the same author, were the earnest effort of human reason to reconcile the finite and the infinite, the human and the divine, the subject and God.

This unquestionably was the problem at which the divine Plato wrought. He struggled with his mighty intellect to peer through the clouds and shadows that environ us, and fix his steady gaze upon the world of spiritual realities beyond. Things which are seen are but the shrine of things which are not seen, the temporal is the shrine of the eternal. The outward phenomena of the world are only passing pictures of invisible realities. The true object of thought must be homogeneous with thought itself. Hence thought must seek communion with being, and only as it does so can it perform its true mission. The *idea* of Plato is not a subjective activity of the mind, not a thought. The Platonic way of thinking was almost the reverse of the psychologic method of our day. "There not thought, but being, was the conditioning principle. Being did not then possess an existence produced and adjudged to it by thought, but an existence obtruding itself and making

*An Essay in aid of a Grammar of Assent. By John Henry Newman, D. D., of the Oratory. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 9 Warren Street, 1870.

Princeton Review, April, 1870. Art. The Relation of Adam's First Sin to the Fall of the Race.

itself felt in thought: the ideas were not dependent on thinking, but thinking was dependent on the ideas; because in Plato's belief, without the previous existence of the ideas, without and above the self-developing thought of the individual, there would be no true thinking and perception at all.*

In Plato's system ideas are in the deepest sense *realities;* hence, although he was an idealist over against the materialistic tendency in ancient philosophy, yet as against the modern distinction of *Nominalism*, he may properly be called the father of *Realism* for all ages. The question of Realism and Nominalism in the middle ages was considered so highly important, not merely as a speculative question of philosophy, but as having an important bearing on theology. On this account it is important still. We do not indeed now conceive the relation between philosophy and religion to be the same as in the Socratic system. With Socrates, to know aright was to be virtuous. We distinguish between religion and theology, and so again between theology and philosophy, but the relation here is most intimate and important. Theology is the science of revelation, —its data are contained in that supernatural revelation which God has made to the world in His Son, Jesus Christ. As a science, however, it must take form according to the laws of human thinking, and hence it will necessarily be modified by our method or system of thinking, which again is determined by our philosophy. Hence while the data, the dogmas, will remain always essentially the same, yet the form in which they are apprehended by thought will be different according to the changing systems of thinking.

Any one who has observed the history of theology must at the same time have noticed how much it is ruled and modified by different systems of philosophy. In the very beginning "the human mind was already in a philosophic condition before it received Christianity, and even before Christianity was offered to it by the divine mind. In the history of man, that which is human precedes, chronologically, that which is divine. "That

---

*Ackerman. *The Christian Element in Plato. Edinburg Edition, pp.* 185, 186.

was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual" (1 Cor. xv. 46). Men are sinners before they are made saints; and they are philosophers before they become theologians. When Christianity was revealed in its last and fullest form, by the incarnation of the Eternal Word, it found the human mind already occupied with a human philosophy. Educated men were Platonists, or Stoics, or Epicureans." *

In the first period of Christianity Platonism ruled the theological thinking of the Christian world, as this came to expression in their schools, as for instance in the school at Alexandria. Subsequently during the middle ages Aristotle became the master as to the method of Dialectics, and then arose the long strife between Realism and Nominalism, which connected itself directly with the interpretation of the dogma. In the Reformation period again a new system of philosophy as well as of theology arose,—a philosophy which was more subjective, psychological, in its method, as well as more independent of theology for the time, and strongly impregnated with rationalism and unbelief. Though starting entirely from the stand-point of mere reason and experience in Descartes and Bacon, it was soon discovered that it could not be divorced from the study of theology. The materialism of England and France, and the idealism of Germany, exerted an immense power in theological science, so much so indeed that the history of the latter cannot be properly understood without the study of the former. Where Locke has been studied and followed in the college, the theology of the seminary has been brought down to the same rationalistic level, and the very confessions themselves are interpreted in a sense very different from that intended by their authors. It is clear, then, that a sound theology is conditioned by a sound philosophy, just as truly as it is necessary to learn to think correctly before we can understand theological science.

One of the most important doctrines of philosophy in its

---

* *History of Christian Doctrine, by Dr. William G. T. Shedd.*

bearing on the study of theology is the theory or doctrine of Realism. This doctrine is, that what are called generals or universals are, not mere arbitrary empty names, names without corresponding objects or contents, nor yet mere subjective conceptions of the mind, but, spiritual, real entities. The conception of the general as related to the particular and single is as old as thinking itself, for generalization is the very first step in pure thinking. We are confronted by single things in the world through the senses. We see a tree, we smell a delicious odor, we hear a piece of music. To the senses these are merely isolated single objects. These single objects can be retained in the mind through our representative or reproductive faculties as images. By means of fancy and memory we can call up in the mind a countenance that no longer confronts our senses, or an event long since passed away.

The mind is so constructed, however, that we do not remain satisfied with merely knowing single objects. These are grasped in their resemblances and relations, and are thus generalized in that substance in which they stand related as parts of a whole. Thus we see and know a number of individuals, as John, Peter, James, etc., and grasping the inner substance of their being, which is the same in all, we call it *man*. The term man comprehends what is common to all men, and yet is not limited to any particular one. Thus we have a general conception which subsumes all that is comprehended in particular individuals, so that what is predicated of the whole can be predicated of all the parts or individuals comprehended under it. This is the only form in which single things or individuals can be known in thought. We can know the single or individual by perception, but we can know only the general by thought, and the individuals only through the general. Man, as a generality, cannot be seen, we cannot form an image of it, but it can be known only in thought. It is a generality, moreover, which is not reached by abstraction and comparison, or by any empirical process. No concrete generality can be reached in that way; for in order to reach it by that method it would be necessary to have before us all possible

men in order to make the comparison, which is impossible. It is only as we have such universals that we can proceed at all in Logic. It is a futile attempt, therefore, which Dr. Newman makes to overthrow the validity of the syllogism by adducing the following example. * "Each thing has its own nature and its own history. When the nature and the history of many things are similar, we say they have the same nature; but there is no such thing as one and the same nature; they are each of them itself, not identical, but like. A law is not a fact, but a notion. 'All men die; therefore Elias has died;' but he has not died, and did not die. He was an exception to the general law of humanity; so far, he did not come under that law, but under the law (so to say) of Elias. It was the law of his individuality, that he left the world without dying; what right have we to subject the person of Elias to the scientific notion of an abstract humanity, which we have formed, without asking his leave? Why must the tyrant majority find a rule for his history? 'All men are mortal;' no; what is really meant is, that man, as such, is mortal, or the abstract, typical *auto-anthropos;* therefore the minor premises ought to be, 'Elias was the *auto-anthropos* or abstract man;' but he was not, and could not, be the abstract man, nor could any one else, any more than the average man of an Insurance Company is every individual man who insures his life with it. Such a syllogism proves nothing about the veritable Elias, except in the way of the antecedent probability. If it be said Elias was exempted from death, not by nature, but by miracle, what is this to the purpose, undeniable as it is; still to have this miraculous exemption was the personal prerogative of Elias. We call it miracle, because God ordinarily acts otherwise He who causes men in general to die, gave it to Elias not to die. This miraculous gift comes into the individuality of Elias. On this individuality we must fix our thoughts, and not begin our notion by ignoring it."

Although it is a digression at this point, we have given this

---

* *Grammar of Assent, p.* 267.

quotation from Dr. Newman's book to show his idea of the general or universal, or rather to show that he denies it altogether. When we say *man* is mortal, the generality, man, necessarily comprehends all individual men. If then we can predicate mortality of the generality man, we must predicate it of all individual men. The law of mortality is *not* a notion, but a fact. The moment you say Elias is a man, that moment you say he is mortal also. Elias was mortal,—he was no exception to the law, but he was taken under a new and higher law in another economy, by which he was translated without the ordinary form of death. The miracle here, instead of overthrowing the universality of the law, only establishes it. Allow Dr. Newman's view of the relation of the particular to the general, and you at once overthrow all science. But this is a digression. The question now is, whether this term *man* is a mere empty, arbitrary name, used for the sake of convenience, representing no real object or entity, as the nominalist contends, or a mere notion or conception of the mind without a corresponding objective entity, as the conceptualist holds, or designates a real spiritual existence, just as real as John, or Peter, or James, according to the doctrine of Realism.

The nominalist asserts that the only ideas which we can frame, or mental objects which we can think of, are individual. Bishop Berkley insists: "The idea of man that I frame to myself must be either of a white, or a black tawny, a straight or a crooked, a tall or a low or a middle-sized man;" plainly implying that we can form no other thought of man, and can by no means go beyond such an idea of an individual. But this is to deny the necessary relation between thought and language, and at the same time it involves the fallacy of using the word idea or thought with a double meaning. If in saying we can form no *idea* of man as a generality, is meant that we can form no *image* corresponding to the word, then we grant it; but this after all is only saying that thought-knowledge is not sense-knowledge. It is of the very nature of thinking that its contents are not, single things, or images of single things, but the general and universal If therefore it is asked whether

we can form a *thought* of man, or humanity, we reply yes, because it is only through thought that the word has been generated.

Does the word *humanity* then designate only a notion, a conception, or thought of the mind? This is asserted by the conceptualist. That the mind can form such notions we think is clear from the fact that it has originated names for them. When we say man, humanity, we express in the form of language, what exists in thought. Humanity, therefore, is a thought, that is, we can think it; but is it merely a thought? As our world-consciousness testifies to us of the objective reality of objects which address the senses, so that it is a violence done to the common sense of men to say that these external objects are only pictures in us, in the same way our consciousness testifies that the objects of thought are objective realities, and not merely notions. And we maintain further that it is only in the light of these general ideas of the reason that either the understanding or the senses can lay hold of the true nature of individual facts or things.

Here it is that we cannot agree with the doctrine of Dr. Newman's book. We allow some force to what he says as to the difference between *inference* and *assent*, the one being a logical conclusion and the other being direct and immediate. Logic can assure us only of the certainty of a conclusion, and not of the premise, whereas assent has to do with the truth of the premise. But we cannot agree with him in the kind of distinction he seeks to draw between what he calls *notional* assent and *real* assent. On page 9 he says, "Of the two modes of apprehending propositions, notional and real, real is the stronger; I mean by stronger the more vivid and forcible. It is so to be accounted for the very reason that it is concerned with what is real or taken for real; for intellectual ideas cannot compete in effectiveness with concrete facts. Various proverbs and maxims sanction me in so speaking, such as 'Facts are stubborn things.' 'Experientia docet,' 'Seeing is believing.'" Again on page 20 he says, "Such are the two modes of apprehension. The terms of a proposition do or do not stand for things. If they do, then they are singular terms,

for all things that are, are units. But if they do not stand for things they must stand for notions, and are common terms. Singular nouns come from experience, common from abstraction. The apprehension of the former I call real, and of the latter notional." "And then it comes to pass that individual propositions about the concrete almost cease to be, and are *diluted or starved into abstract notions.*" By individual propositions about the concrete here he means facts or things, as for instance, Cain killed Abel, of which we can form an *image*, if the fact has not been witnessed directly; and by diluted or starved abstract notions he means that which can be known only to thought, as, man is depraved and carries murder in his heart. Now what we maintain is, that the real power of a fact or a thing to affect us lies, not in itself as an isolated fact or thing, but just in this "diluted and starved abstract notion" as he calls it. The fact of a murder is horrifying just because we interpret it in the light of what is more awful, viz. the sinful, fallen state of man; it moves us so strongly not for what it is in itself—as such it is only a passing phenomenon, without any moral constitution or connection—but because it is a voice rising up from the depths of depraved human life. A beautiful work of art impresses, pleases us, but in order to do so we must be in communication, in harmony, with the idea of beauty in the light and power of which only it can be a living thing.

To our understanding Dr. Newman allows general terms to be expressive only of notions, and not of deeper realities than individual or single things. How can he maintain that "all things that are, are units, and all common names are merely notional?" Does he mean to say that U. S. Grant as president is a reality, but the term president expresses only a diluted and starved abstraction? If so, he uses the merest deception. Of the two we should say the office is more real, of greater significance, than the man. True the office separated from the man is an abstraction, but united, or concrete, in the man, it is that which constitutes him what he is. A beautiful painting is a real thing in Dr. Newman's opinion, and the idea of beauty

an abstraction; but the idea of beauty is more real than the painting, for it lives in all beautiful works of art, while this one painting may be destroyed. No; single things, units, are not the only things that are. The genus is more than the individual, the general than the particular. Law as a generality is more than any single statute. "Real apprehension, then, may be pronounced stronger than notional, because *things*, which are its objects, are confessedly more impressive and effective than *notions*, which are the objects of notional." Clearly in his view all generals are merely notions.

What he calls notions, or abstractions, are the data of reason. Reason is the faculty or department of our nature which apprehends necessary and universal ideas, in the light of which only the process of the discursive faculty, the understanding, can be of any meaning. The fact that the general can reach us only in the concrete does not justify by any means the expressions our author uses. He denies all existence to the general except as notion. This general false theory comes out, again, where he treats of what he calls presumption, which he classes under notional assent. "Sometimes we trust in our power of reasoning and memory, that is, our implicit assent to their telling truly, is treated as a first principle; but we cannot properly be said to have any trust in them as faculties. At most we trust in particular acts of memory and reasoning. We are sure there was a yesterday, and that we did this or that in it; we are sure that three times six is eighteen, and that the diagonal of a square is longer than the side. So far as this we may be said to trust the mental act, by which the object of our assent is verified; *but, in doing so, we imply no recognition of a general power or faculty, or of any capability or affection of our minds, over and above the particular act.* We know indeed that we have a faculty by which we remember, as we know that we have a faculty by which we breathe; but we gain this knowledge by abstraction or inference from its particular acts, not by direct experience."

Now we grant that our knowledge *by experience* is a knowledge only of the particular, but we deny that all

knowledge of what is general comes only by abstraction or inference. On the other hand we affirm that we assent to the general by the intuitions of reason, and this assent precedes the knowledge of experience, or at least is so *in* the knowledge of experience that without it experience would have no meaning. Our consciousness of an outward world lies at the basis of all our experience of that world in coming in contact with particular things through the senses. So, too, Descartes assented to his own existence before he said, I think. His *ergo sum*, which he regarded as an inference, lay already in the premise, *cogito*, for he could not say I think, without saying at the same time I *am* thinking, in which propositions he already asserts his existence.

Dr. Newman denies that the proposition, "things exist external to ourselves," is a first principle, and one of universal reception. He maintains that we come to it by an inductive process. Hence he calls it a notional proposition, and assent to it merely notional, whereas assent to the existence of a stick or a tree that confronts our sense is real assent. In the same way he makes the expressions "There is a right and a wrong," "a true and a false," "a just and an unjust," "a beautiful and a deformed," abstractions to which we give a national assent *in consequence* of our particular experience of qualities in the concrete, to which we give a real assent. If he had said that our particular experiences are the *condition* of awakening our consciousness of right and wrong, or the sight of a beautiful object the condition of awakening the idea of the beautiful which we possess innately, we could agree with him. Or if he had said, the idea of the beautiful authenticates its presence and power in the concrete, we could adopt the statement. But he seems to us to deny the reality of any such objective ideas, except as notions of the mind formed empirically. To this we demur. So, too, he calls belief in causation a presumption, which he argues (pp. 63 and 64) comes by experience and is only notional. He denies the necessary uniformity in the action of the laws of nature. "Nor indeed, has it yet been proved, nor ought it to be assumed even, that the law of ve-

locity of falling bodies on the earth is invariable in its operation; for that again is only an instance of the general proposition, which is the very thesis in debate." Now it is true that by induction we can never establish the fact that all bodies, by the operation of the law of gravitation, will fall to the earth, for experience can never measure all possible facts in the case, but the idea of law does not come from induction or experience. Experience only leads to its discovery. Without an idea or sense of an economy of nature as under the control of universal and necessary laws, we can get no proper idea of a miracle; for a miracle is not merely an exception to the course of facts in nature, as though the same divine will which causes a stone to fall to the earth now exerts itself directly to make it fly upwards. The true idea of a miracle allows the full force of the laws or economy of nature, but sees the incoming of another and higher economy, which consists, not in single acts of the divine will, but in the operation of higher laws standing in that economy.

To our mind Dr. Newman's book seems to make a divorce between the world which is for thought and the world for sense, making the latter a real world and the former a notional world, so far at least as our assents are concerned. Individual things address the senses, they are real, and to propositions into which they enter a real assent is given; but when we come to deal with what is general we are out of the region of reality, and in the world of notions. But what he calls the world of notions and the world of single things are one and the same world, and not two. Ideas of design, general laws, genera and species, these are the real living powers of which the outward and the visible are the shrine, and our assent to the latter carries with it also an apprehension of the former. Not, it may be, with an intellectual comprehension. Many an uneducated man feels the presence and power of beauty in a beautiful object, even though he may never have learned to distinguish here between the idea and the visible presentation. But it is one world for him, and not two. The intuitions of the reason lie back both of the activities of the sense and of

the understanding, and in these intuitions they find their true unity.

This difficulty we feel as we read on through the beautiful and forcible chapters on Religious Assents, especially on the Belief in the Holy Trinity. He sums up thus: "Religion has to do with the real, and the real is the particular; theology has to do with what is notional, and the notional is the general and systematic. Hence theology has to do with the dogma of the Holy Trinity as a whole made up of many propositions; but religion has to do with each of those separate propositions which compose it, and lives and thrives in the contemplation of them. In them it finds the motives for devotion and faithful obedience; while theology on the other hand forms and protects them by virtue of its function of regarding them, not merely one by one, but as a system of truth."

With the distinction drawn between religion and theology in the main we can agree. Theology is to revelation what science is to the natural world. The supernatural world addresses our religious nature directly, as the natural world addresses us through the senses, and not as it reaches us in science. All this we can see. The Holy Trinity as a dogma for theology, is something different from the Holy Trinity as it confronts us for our reverence and worship. But must not the objective contents of the dogma of the Trinity for thought, be the same as the objective reality of the Trinity for faith? Must not our theology of the Holy Trinity agree with our faith in the same? For the purpose of religion, it is not indeed necessary that the individual should have in his mind the explanation or understanding of the dogma as contained in theology. But religion must find the same objective contents for faith that theology finds for thought. We are confronted in this Holy mystery with the Trinity of persons. The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God. But this is not the whole of the reality in the mystery of the Trinity. There is also the unity of essence, that in which they are one. This is the one nature of the Godhead, as humanity is the one nature in all

men.* I do not mean that this analogy explains the mystery of the unity in essence of the Godhead, but I introduce it because nominalism and conceptualism must deny the objective reality of the divine essence or nature, just as they deny the objective entity of human nature Dr. Newman says that the mystery of the Trinity, as such, is not the direct object of real or religious apprehension, but only the separate propositions, each by itself, of which the dogma is composed. The particulars, that is the persons, are real, the general, that is the essence, is notional. So we understand him. But will not this land us in that tri-theism which was charged upon the nominalists in the middle ages? It was indeed charged upon realism that in holding to the objective entity of the general, the essence, we would have a fourth element, but this difficulty is avoided by holding that the same divine essence is not before, *universalia ante rem*, nor out of, the three persons, but in them according to the formula, *universalia in re.* Yet because the divine essence is only in three persons, it does not follow that it is only a notion, or a generalization of the mind.

"He" (God) "at once is Father, is Son, is Holy Ghost, each of whom is that One Personal God in the fulness of His being and attributes." So far we agree, but we are not so clear when he adds, "so that the Father is all that is meant by the word 'God,' as if we knew nothing of Son or of Spirit; and in like manner the Son and the Spirit are each by Himself all that is meant by the word, as if the Other and the Father were unknown." We cannot see how the Trinity of

* We anticipate here a patently weak objection of the Princeton Review where it argues, that to apply this analogy of the unity of the human race with a plurality of persons to the Trinity is to divest the Trinity of all mystery. It says, "The unity of essence and plurality of persons is precisely that which exists among men, and there is no more that is incomprehensible in it than in the plurality of human persons having a common humanity. Is this all the mystery of the Trinity?" We answer, no; this is not all. It is only an analogy. All organic unities are analogies, reflections of that highest of all unities, the unity of the Holy Trinity, but because we refer to them as analogies, does it follow that we allow no higher mystery in the one than in the other? Besides we think the author of the above quotation has not yet fathomed the meaning of the true unity of the race, if he imagines that it presents nothing mysterious for our apprehension.

persons can be any more separated from the unity of essence for faith than for knowledge. Our worship must be of the One in Three, and of the Three in One, and the One here, while it is not in any sense a fourth person, is yet as real as the Three. We may misunderstand Dr. Newman, but if he builds his explanation of the Trinity on either nominalism or conceptualism, as he seems to us to do, in our opinion he must become involved in error. One of the weaknesses, or faults, of much of the theology of our day, we may add while we are on this part of our subject, lies just in its departure from the logic of faith. Because theology is not religion, the knowledge of revelation not faith in what is revealed, it seems to be imagined that the two need not necessarily follow the same order. Hence our modern theologies make it a matter of small account that they depart from the order of the Creed, as though the revelation could properly be understood in a different order than that in which it is apprehended by faith. The Christological principle of the Creed must be also the principle for all true theology. So the older theologians proceeded. But now it is thought that the theology can commence with some merely theistic conception, and so arrange a new and different order from that laid down in the Creed. And the practical effect of all this is an undervaluing of theology, and them a senseless tirade against it, because it is not religion. And hence it comes, too, that theological or doctrinal preaching is decried, and the life of whole denominations becomes feeble and faltering because it has no earnest theology.

Leaving now any further notice of Dr. Newman's book, which we have referred to only in so far as it touches on our general subject, let us consider some other points in theology with which the doctrine of realism has to do.

The true nature and bearing of the fall, in its relation to the race, can be properly understood only as we attribute proper substantiality to that in which the unity of the race consists. According to the doctrine of realism, as already stated in this article, humanity is an entity, a generality which constitutes the *genus homo*, and not a mere notion, obtained from a process

of abstraction. The general life, and the individual, were united in Adam; he was in one sense a universal man, including in himself potentially all the individuals who were to descend from him; and he was also an individual like other members of the human family. When he fell, humanity fell, and human nature became corrupt in this its fountain head. When we say, therefore, man is fallen, the term man expresses not an abstract generality, not a generality obtained empirically, for it includes not only all men that have been and are, but all that are possible. It is only on this hypothesis that we can feel assured that all born from Adam are and will be sinful as he was sinful.

The *Princeton Review* for April, of the present year, contains an article in which an effort is made to controvert this doctrine of the derivation of the fall of the race from Adam's first sin. The article admits that there is an organic or vital connection of the race with Adam. "This all admit, who admit that the race is descended from him by ordinary generation." The federal school do not hold the race to be a "sand-heap," or embrace any "atomistic conception of its unity." And yet in a subsequent paragraph the article adopts the theory of nominalism, and rejects that of realism. It says, referring to Lange's Commentary on Romans, "Dr. Schaff speaks of denying the unity of the race in the realistic sense," "from nominalistic premises, according to which the general conceptions are mere names, not things—subjective abstractions, not objective realities. Such nominalism as this is not the only alternative to realism. The general conceptions which represent the resembling qualities of the race, represent real qualities which belong to man, and not mere names. They stand not for fictions, but realities; not however, the reality of philosophic realism, or the numerical oneness of substance of the descendants of Adam or of all the individuals of any class."

This sort of realistic nominalism leaves us, however, without any true unity of the race. If the general term humanity designates the resembling qualities of the race, we cannot stop here, but we must seek to know the cause of this similarity in different individuals, and we are thus led back to the common

source and the common life. These resemblances are not themselves the true unity of the organism, but by observing them we discover that unity in the generic law which holds all the parts or members of the organism in unity. This is the generality, and this is a real objective entity, existing, however, only in the parts or members.

The article then proceeds to give certain "insuperable objections," to the realistic view of the fall in its relation to the race, which we shall briefly notice. They are as follows:

1. "It directly contradicts the intuitive convictions and normal consciousness of the human mind."

What is meant here is that men do not feel that their acts of sin are identical with Adam's act, that the act of the parent is the act of his child. This is true, but the unity of the race lies not in an act, nor in personal, conscious existence, but in the nature or life which is deeper than these. Now we believe "the intuitive convictions and normal consciousness of the human mind" testify to this oneness of nature, as that in which the fall has reality for each person. Each one feels a personal responsibility for his own acts, but he feels also that these acts stand in a fallen nature which is one with that of Adam. This appeal, however, can decide neither one way nor the other, when once there is a difference as to what the intuitive convictions of the mind are. We leave it as deciding nothing for or against.

2. "As Turretin observes, on this theory all the acts of Adam are ours just as much as his first sin. They are the acts of the *genus homo*, a 'single and simple essence,' common to him and all his posterity. The 'one offence,' or first sin to which the Scriptures and the Church attribute the fall of the race, has no more to do with it than any other sin, except that it is chronologically first in the series of his transgressions. All his other sins are as much those of generic humanity, and as much corrupt it, as this. Not only so, but if all our race have in them a 'generic humanity' not merely of resembling qualities and a common origin, but which is one numerical substance pervading all, whereby the act of the first man is the

act of all, then not only are all his acts the acts of every other man, but the acts of each and every man are the acts of each and every other man. The merit and demerit of each belong to all. All personal identity and responsibility are utterly confounded and vacated."

We have given the whole paragraph containing this objection. It seems to us to be exceedingly weak. It does not seem to consider that the first act of disobedience on the part of our first parents was a determining act, and in this respect unlike all other acts. Did not the writer consider that the first act by which, even now, virtue falls, determines the character, and that subsequent commissions of sin are only the same act continued? All men are partakers in the first act of transgression, not consciously or directly, but mediately through that common nature in which they are one. Hence the act which determined the nature was unique. All subsequent acts are fruits of that first act, and hence cannot, in the nature of the case, be of equal significance.

But we are willing to concede that there is a deep sense in which the sin of each member of the human race even now is the sin of every other. There is a community of sin and guilt, because the root of all sin is in each one, and where a crime is committed every one feels that he has a share in it, because in his heart naturally the same sin exists in germ. All true penitence concedes that the repentance is not for individual acts of sin only, but for sin in its generic character as including all acts of transgression. Hence no one can say to his brother, I am naturally better than thou. Only in this view can we see how it was possible for Christ to take upon Himself the sins of the whole world. He did this by taking upon Him sin and guilt as a whole, not as separate acts of transgression. Now, as the first sin was thus generic in its character, it is clear that it included all that followed, and to partake in that included participation also in all that followed, but only mediately through that first transgression. This objection seems to us so weak, and the refutation so clear, that we deem it unnecessary to dwell upon it further.

3. "The (realistic) theory fails to furnish the relief in regard to the fall of the race in Adam's fall, for which it is adduced. For, as we have seen, they assert that there was no 'conscious' or 'personal' 'participation' of Adam's posterity in his sin. This would imply that they 'existed before they existed.' How a 'participation' which was neither conscious nor personal, and before actual existence infers blame or guilt in them for Adam's first sin, or accounts for its imputation to them as a ground of punishment, unless on account of some special constitution or covenant constituting him their representative, we cannot understand, nor do we believe the unsophisticated human intellect can understand it."

To which we reply, that men do exist as unconscious beings before they exist as conscious beings. Who will deny this? The actual sins of every individual are but the outgrowth of original sin, or of a sinful nature, which precedes conscious existence. *Persona corrumpit naturam, natura corrumpit personam.* There is no more contradiction in holding that personal sins grow out of a single nature in the same person, which we know to be a fact, than there is in holding that they grow out of the depraved nature of our first parents.

4. "The last objection which we shall now stop to specify, is that arising from the whole parallelism between the condemnation of the race through Adam's sin, and the justification of believers through the righteousness of Christ. The realistic scheme imputes the sin of Adam because of our literal and real participation in it. In like manner, then, we must be justified by Christ's righteousness, because it is literally ours—because we have such a oneness with Him that we really have performed those acts of obedience which He has performed."

We accept the inference, for we believe this is the only explanation of justification which relieves it of that fiction by which God is made to pronounce those justified who are not justified in fact. The outward imputation theory here is just as obnoxious as the outward imputation of sin. This brings us to another dogma of theology upon which the doctrine of realism has an important bearing.

In the relation of the believer to Christ there is also a generic and an individual, personal, life. The parallel with our relation to Adam is recognized by our Saviour, where He compares the second birth to the first. As in natural birth these two factors, the general or generic and the individual, are united, so also in the birth from above. The analogy of the vine and the branches, and of the head and the members, is used also, not surely to have us infer that the union of Christ and His people is less real, is less a life-union, than that which holds in these analogies from nature, but rather that it is more real, and that the union holds here in that life which is the basis and source of all other life.

The forms of expression employed by the Reformers seem to favor the forensic view of imputation, because they were opposing the error of the Romanists, who give to works a share in the justification of the sinner; but interpreted in the light of their other teachings these expressions clearly allow the vital union with Christ as included in the sinner's justification. Dr. Forbes, in his valuable commentary on Romans, quotes even from Owen on Justification to this effect: "When God doth justify the ungodly on account of the righteousness imputed unto him, he doth at the same instant, by the power of His grace, make him inherently and subjectively righteous or holy." And so very truly Dr. Forbes himself remarks: "Having been condemned by the one transgression of Adam, we are in like manner justified by the one righteousness of Christ. But this in no merely outward way, or by a legal figment, but involving the realities of 'Sin' and 'Righteousness,' as affecting inwardly those on whom the judicial sentences have passed."

The life of Christ, as including our redeemed and glorified humanity, is here the true font and germ of all true life in the believer. And upon the reality of this general life depends the reality of all individual Christian life in the believer.

It is a futile objection to this that the *Princeton Review*, and Dr. Hodge on the Atonement, urge, when they say that "thus we are justified by inherent righteousness, not solely by

another's righteousness, imputed to us and received by faith alone." The righteousness of the believer here is the righteousness of Christ. All allow that it has become the believer's in some sense; the only difference is whether we shall call it his by an imputation which implies a fiction in the divine mind, or by an imputation which makes the divine judgment at the same time an act in deed and in truth.

Passing on we refer yet briefly to the application of this same theory in its bearing on the doctrine of the Church. As an article of Faith the idea, or the ideal Church, must be felt to lie back of that which is visible in the particular members. No induction, or process of abstraction, can give us what is set forth in the Creed as the Holy Catholic Church. The Church is not a mere name, having no corresponding real contents; it is not merely a conception of the mind, but in its ideal character it is a most glorious reality, including divine and heavenly powers, revealing their presence in that which is visible and temporal. Only in this view is it the mystery for faith which is set before us in the New Testament. Ideally it is complete, carrying in it the powers of the world to come, the æon of æons, world without end. In its actual state, however, it never fully realizes the full measure of its life, until the final glorification takes place, when the earthly shall be fully transformed into the heavenly.

Now take the other view. Say that the only reality in the Church is the individual members in their separate capacity. Get the idea of their unity by their being associated in congregation or denomination, let "the general conception represent the resembling qualities of the members, call these qualities real qualities which belong to Christians, and not mere names," according to the *Princeton Review*, and how poor and lean the conception! how infinitely short it falls of the view of the Church, as the Lamb's Bride, the Body of Christ, presented in the New Testament and believed on in all ages as the *Holy Catholic Church*. Here we have no mystery for faith. There may be mystery in the character of the individual Christians

who compose it, but the communion as such is no mystery, but only an empirical abstraction.

We have referred thus briefly to these several points of Christian doctrine, because the whole subject is now being treated at length in a series of articles in this REVIEW on *Organic Redemption*, by Dr. S. H. Giesy.

Let us not be misunderstood now, as though we are making the interpretation of the glorious realities of faith depend upon a philosophical doctrine. Let no one say, your theology rests on your philosophy, your faith on the weak foundation of reason. Such an inference would be an entire misunderstanding of our whole article. Let all philosophical theories fall to the ground and perish, and the verities of faith still remain. Surely the Holy Trinity is believed in, and the Headship of Christ, and the Holy Catholic Church, and the fall is realized and felt as a terrible world-fact, by millions who have never heard of realism or nominalism, as philosophical doctrines or theories. All this may be in the sphere of religion. In the science of theology it is different. Here the very idea of science implies an order of thought. Our philosophy will necessarily give shape and coloring to our theology. The natural and the supernatural are related to each other in such way, that the one is the picture of the other. In the world of nature we have analogies of the supernatural world.

It is already something that confessedly the greatest philosophic mind of ancient times, and we are not sure but that we may say, of all times, the divine Plato, with only the light of nature, so interpreted the creation of God. And with him essentially agreed the greatest dialectician of ancient, if not of all times, Aristotle. Both were less than the least in Judaism, and, much more, in Christianity, where the true light after which they were seeking shines in its mid-day splendor. It is undeniable, however, that on the plane of mere reason, these ancient intellectual giants, the exponents of the highest natural civilization, attained a degree of intellectual culture, which, as to its form, has, perhaps, never been excelled. Apart from the new contents for thought which Christianity has brought into

the world, we are inclined to doubt whether anything new has been brought forward in logic or philosophy since Plato and Aristotle. Be this as it may, however, it is something, that a man like Plato looked at the world as the outward shrine of invisible patterns and powers, which constituted its true reality. And we may at least inquire whether it was not through the highest exercise, not merely of the understanding, but, of reason, which holds by intuition general and universal ideas, that Plato, the world's seer, beheld the corresponding objective realities of the creation. He could, indeed, go no further. He could not relegate these ideas to the Eternal Logos, by whom the worlds were made—for He had not yet come in His incarnation; but surely it was the glorious reflection of the coming heavenly kingdom which he beheld, by the light of reason, in the natural creation.

Why should not this natural creation, in the way he looked at it, be for us the analogy of the supernatural order to which we now direct the eye of faith? As by the intuitions of reason we grasp the universal and necessary ideas that are figured to us in the passing phenomena of the visible world, so by faith we lay hold of the glorious mysteries of the supernatural world, as they reach us in the visible forms of Christianity.

Philosophic thinking, as we have seen, is necessary to the study of theology. How important that it should be deeply spiritual, and not a mere flat and shallow empiricism. And when we consider, moreover, that a shallow or false theology reacts again on religion itself, we may be able to see how it is that philosophy becomes invested with such high importance.

Art. VI.—FAITH IN CREATION.

By Rev. S. N. Callender, A. M., Greencastle, Pa.

The capital error which has vitiated much of the thinking of philosophers on the doctrine of Creation, consists in taking a datum of Reason, instead of a postulate of Faith for its point of departure. For a synthetical view of this doctrine, pure reason can in no possibility furnish a sufficient base principle. And it is for precisely this reason, that the origin of the universe has in all ages, been a puzzle to speculative thinkers. The whole edifice of ancient philosophy is a sad monument of this fact. But in later modern times, one would suppose that Kant's definition of the powers and limits of pure reason, would have put his successors upon their guard upon this point, and saved them from falling, on the one hand, into the abyss of *nihilism*, or on the other, into the more specious, and so more dangerous error of *pantheism*. Besides these two forms of error upon this subject, we may mention the old Persian doctrine of *dualism;* affirming the duplex origin of the world, as the result of the good principle of light, and the evil principle of darkness. But never with truth, has speculation been able to say, by *reason*, we understand that the worlds were *created*.

We are well aware that the faith-principle has been by some, ruled out of the field of speculative philosophy as insufficient for cognitive certainty. But it ought to be seen by this time, that this is to deny to man, altogether the power of knowing the supernatural.

A cognition, is the comprehension of the content of an intuition, whether objective or subjective, in the innate idea of reason, which idea is drawn into the light of consciousness by this intuition as an occasion. Reason is not a perceptive faculty beyond

the sphere of its own principial or ideal contents. These it can cognize only however, as just said, upon occasion of the presentation of an object through the medium of the subordinate faculties, apprehended primarily by that one which is perceptive of the objective. But beyond its own principial contents, its knowledge cannot go. No intuition, without which, as occasion, the ideas of reason can never emerge into consciousness, can ever serve to *generate* an idea which is not creatively contained in reason. Locke's doctrine upon this subject has been sufficiently exploded, as well by criticism, as by the fearful results to which it has been developed. If then an object can be cognized, it is only as, *a priori*, contained in its principle in reason.

If then the doctrine of creation be a postulate of reason, it must lie embosomed in reason as a constructive principle, which will become patent to consciousness, upon occasion of the data of the intuition of sense. This, we take it, is the meaning of O. A. Brownson, when in his introduction to *Balmes' Fundamental Philosophy* he affirms that the *creative act* is intuitive. But do we find this to be empirically true? Is it the universal testimony of the human consciousness, that the world was created, that is *made?* Reason indeed teaches that there must be a *first cause.* But it does not, and cannot teach the modus of the relation of the effect to the cause.

The consciousness of dependence, the sense of moral obligation awakens man to the idea of God. Natural religion is able to postulate *a* God. But who or what that God is, is to the speculative reason, to this day a confounding riddle—an unknown God. But the idea of a God being given, have we any testimony of consciousness, or datum of reason, by which we can be assured that creation is a free act of the divine will, rather than the pantheistic notion of an emanation or procession? Can reason demonstrate that God is not *Absolute Subject*, or *Absolute Substance*, or *Absolu'e Mind*, and that nature is not the legitimate development of the one or the other? This it could unquestionably do, did the doctrine of creation exist as an idea in reason. But furthermore, the doctrine that God

created the universe, and that it did not emanate from or develop out of His being, is not in fact a principle or an idea at all. It is a question of fact. The principle involved in the fact is, a final cause—that God is the cause of all things. But how He as cause produced the effect, is not involved in the principle.

All this will be sufficiently plain, if we for a moment consider the relation of reason as a cognitive faculty, to the order of nature on the one hand, and to the supernatural on the other. Man is a microcosm; comprehending in himself the whole order of nature, in the form of idea. Were not this the case, it would even be impossible for him to know the world or any part of it. His reason as the ultimate cognitive faculty is the *locus principiorum*—the repository of ideas, in the light of which the objective world comes to its proper significance. It is not simply a mirror in which it is reflected, but the focus of intellectual light which illuminates the object, and apprehends it in its true meaning. Reason may be said then to be the comprehensive measure of nature; that is, for man there is nothing contained in nature, which is not equally contained in reason; the one in the form of objective reality, the other in the form of idea—the one complementary to the other. If then there are contents in objective nature, which are not ideally contained in reason, the human mind can never cognize them; and if on the other hand there is a given cognition in the mind, which is not contained validly in objective nature, we must necessarily conclude that it belongs to another sphere, *viz.* the supernatural.

The organ for the apprehension of the objective on the side of the natural, is sense; the contents of which are colligated by the understanding, into a conception or notion, and by it brought into the sphere of the containing idea of reason. The intuition of sense then furnishes the matter of cognition, while the understanding and reason furnish the form, and comprehending idea. Not however as mere empty forms. For form and principle are equally as essential to the reality of the objective, as they are to the subjective apprehension. The voice of

later criticism has pronounced very decisively against Kant, upon this point, who makes our subjective activities *purely* formal, and holds these quite as authoritative for objective validity in their sphere, as are the intuitions of sense, in its sphere. The cognitions of reason then are conditioned by the intuitions of sense as their occasion, as well as their matter, and without these they could never have emerged into consciousness. But on the other hand, these intuitions of sense can never furnish *form* for our cognitions, they can only serve to draw into the light of consciousness the complementary forms which are already ideally contained in reason. Unless then the doctrine of creation exists as a constructive principle or idea, creatively in the constitution of the human spirit, no intuition of sense could ever become the occasion of its evolution into the light of consciousness, and thus become a cognition. That such is not the case, we think is now sufficiently plain.

But the cognitions of reason are not confined to the sphere of the natural. This they would be, were its ideas limited by nature, and a knowledge of the supernatural would then be an absolute impossibility. But these ideas being in themselves necessary and universal, they transcend the sphere of the natural, and are capable of receiving contents from the sphere of the supernatural. But this only through the medium of a perceptive faculty. Such a faculty we find in faith. Faith is the sense for the supernatural, "the evidence of things not seen." Here we discern the possibility of a revelation,—the possibility for man to know the wondrous facts of creation and redemption. We must therefore hold it to be a mistake, when faith is ruled out of the domain of philosophy, on the ground of its not being sufficient for cognitive certainty.

But is it true that the intuition of sense is the only mean by which the objective is made the matter of cognition even in the natural order? Will it be affirmed that our knowledge of the universe is limited to that which we have seen and touched? Or in other words, that all of the objective which we have not intuited through sensation and perception, must be said to be unknown to us? Then indeed are our cognitions comprehended

within narrow limits. What relation, do all objects and things which lie outside of the range of our sense intuitions, and of which we have learned from the words and writings of others, sustain to our understanding and reason? Can we be said to be ignorant of them? Do we not *know* them? True not in the sense that we know through sense intuitions. But still have we not a cognition of them which is sufficient for rational certainty? It will not suffice to say that they are for us mere empty forms of thought without objective contents. How do I know that the city of St. Petersburg has an existence? I have never had a sense perception of it, and can it be said now that I have no knowledge of its existence, or that the knowledge I may have of it, is any less potent for certainty than if I had seen it? What I know of its existence may be denominated a faith-cognition. Not a mere supposition or persuasion which can furnish no solid ground for the conviction of certainty, but such a firm assurance, which could not be added to by a sense-perception. Sir Wm. Hamilton, following the lead of some of the old scholastics, has clearly pointed out the fact that there are two kinds of knowledge; the immediate and the mediate.* The first, sense cognition; the second, cognition through representation by memory or the imagination; and we may add without overreaching his conception, by faith. For by this last is the representation presented to the percipient mind, and equally furnishes the matter of thought.

As already intimated, a cognition consists of two elements, the form, and the contents or matter. If either element be wanting, it can never be sufficient for objective validity. Now if we have no other faculty to furnish matter for our cognitions than sense, then must sense furnish contents for all our knowledge of the supernatural; or, the alternative is, that this knowledge, if indeed it is entitled to be called knowledge at all, is merely formal. Take for instance the divine attribute of Omnipotence. Can we ever reach that conception by generalization? Let us see. Reason furnishes the idea of a final cause,

* *Lectures on Metaphysics*, pp. 313 and Seq.

which it denominates God. We now consider the fact of nature around and above us. We gather it all into our sense perception. We discern in each effect the monument of power as efficient in its cause, and thus we proceed inductively from effect to cause indefinitely, until arrested by reason's postulate of a final cause. In all this process we have the notion of power growing and enlarging at every step, until at last, it attains to indefinite proportions. But is this the conception of *infinite* power? Is this omnipotence? Far from it. This is but a datum of the *understanding*, and this faculty can never attain the infinite.* The most it can predicate of divine power is, that it is *indefinite*, but there is an immeasurable abyss between the *indefinite* and the *infinite*. So that so far as sense-perception is concerned, the conception of omnipotence is without contents, and cannot be sufficient for objective validity. But with faith-perception it is different. The *idea* is creatively lodged in reason; here we have the form, else could the human mind never cognize it, and for matter we have it in the sphere of the supernatural, presented by revelation and intuited by faith. And for faith it is as potent for rational certainty, as it could possibly be did it fall in the category of sense.

To make this sufficiently manifest, let any one appeal to the teaching of consciousness. Let him call to mind any fact or object of which he has but a faith-cognition. It was testimony which furnished him the material out of which the understanding constructed the conception or image. But how does he know that this is not empty—a pure fancy? If the testimony was of such a character as to work faith in him, then has he that which carries the conviction of objective validity. It is faith that does this, not the testimony, for testimony is wholly inefficient in this regard, up to the point of working faith. Faith then is the evidence of things not seen, as well in the na-

* Had Sir Wm. Hamilton and his disciple Mansell confined their doctrine to the powers of the understanding, they might with justice have denied the cogitability of the infinite, but not so as applied to the reason. Reason is the faculty for the infinite, and not subject to the conditions of time and space.

tural order as in the supernatural. And that such faith-cognition is as cogent for certainty as sense-cognition, let this person bring the object under the intuition of sense, and see whether certainty has become a particle more certain. For me to see the city of St. Petersburg, while it would change the kind of knowledge I have of its existence, it could not add aught to the weight of certainty.

Now the same holds true of the supernatural order. Reason comprehends within itself those necessary and universal ideas, which, transcending on all hands the sphere of the natural, reach out into the supernatural, make it possible for the human spirit to commune with and know it. All truth then beyond the limits of the natural order, can be presented to reason only in the form of revelation, and to the extent that revelation works faith and is apprehended by it, do its teachings become *for it* objective realities, and thus fully competent for certainty. If then we would not deny the possibility of knowing the supernatural, as well also as the natural itself, beyond the sphere of sense-perceptions, we must hold that it is an error to discard the faith-principle from philosophy as incompetent for certainty.

From this we are able to see why the author of the inspired cosmogony did not commence with the declarations, There is a God, or Every effect must have a cause, or Every phenomenon has an underlying substance. No, His commission was not to teach science, and therefore he assumed all these data of the natural reason. But it was His office to reveal truths which lay back of, and beyond the sphere of the natural. And therefore His first word was what natural reason could never have affirmed; "In the beginning God *created* the heavens and the earth."

The fullness of time has then certainly come, when philosophers should recognize the fact that no datum of reason can serve as a key to unlock the mystery of creation;—that whether grasping the emptiest *a priori* idea and proceeding synthetically and deductively, or commencing with the concrete particular, and proceeding analytically by induction and generaliza-

tion, logic is wholly impotent for the resolution of the question. The history of philosophy from the beginning articulates no lesson more distinctly than just this. The modus of the origin of the universe is a question of historical fact, and comes to no illustration in its projection. It lies back of the macrocosm, and must equally so lie back of the human microcosm. It lies embosomed in the mysteries of the supernatural order, and human reason can know it at all, only as it is revealed to faith. For as already said, reason can cognize only on occasion of the intuitions of the perceptive or matter-furnishing faculties. This is true in the order of nature, for if we had no perceptive faculties, we would forever be ignorant of the objective existence of nature. It is equally true in the order of the supernatural. Here faith is the perceptive, intuitive faculty, and it is in its own sphere, what sense is in its sphere. And in both cases must the intuition be in accord with, that is it dare never contradict the universal and necessary ideas of reason. Otherwise it cannot be truth for the human spirit.*

---

* It will be borne in mind that this is affirmed of *reason,* not of the *understanding.* The conclusions of the discursive faculty are not to be taken as the measure of truth, but the universal and necessary ideas of objective reason are.

Art. VII.—CONDITIONS OF SUCCESS IN LIFE.*

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, A. M., POTTSTOWN, PA.

Fellow Alumni!

Is it not delightful to meet again at the place where we once enjoyed so many pleasant hours? Scenes arise before our mind's eye so roseate and beautiful that it seems impossible that such a *fata morgana* should ever have been real. Do you, for instance, remember what vague anticipations we once entertained with reference to just such occasions as the one which brings us together to-night, and how heartily we sang:

> "When we come again together
> Vigintennial to pass,
> Wives and children all included,
> Won't we have an uproarious class?"

Well! here we are—wives and children all included—but, somehow or other, the classes do not seem to be so "*uproarious*" after all. Still, we feel to-night, as though we would gladly sing the good old song again, if we had companions of our own age to keep us in countenance. "Of our own age." There! The words have unwittingly escaped us. Is it possible that we are no longer boys? Can it be that we are growing old—that time is plowing furrows of care on our brows, and that strands of silver are finding their way over our temples? It is even so. The world no longer calls us boys. The golden time has passed, never to return; but when we visit Alma Mater we *will* be boys, whatever the wicked world may say!

Is it taking too great a liberty to remind the venerable President of this institution that, three years ago, he told us,

* An Address delivered before the Alumni Association of Franklin and Marshall College, on Wednesday Evening, June 29th, 1870. Published at the request of the Association.

that with him "it is an easy illusion to think of us still as boys, and thus almost to forget the present in the past?" We are glad to remember these words of affection, and are heartily willing to continue *boys* so long as he remains OUR FATHER.

When we meet again on Commencement Day after long years of absence, we sometimes imagine we hear our Alma Mater asking us: "Boys, what have you been doing all this time? Have you realized the dreams of your youth? What new libation do you offer at my shrine?"

"Alas! mother," we mournfully reply, "we have little or nothing to bring you. We have made no great discoveries; in fact, it does not seem as though there were a single Newton or Leibnitz among us. We had poets once—great men they seemed to us before their beards were grown—whose poetry appeared to be so full of genuine inspiration that we could not distinguish it from that of the greatest masters of verse. Somehow or other—it is a mystery which we cannot understand—they have become as mute as the harp of Tara. Their Pegasus must have been a lame jade after all. Our incipient statesmen too, have disappeared, and those of our band who are now climbing the ladder of political preferment are generally the quiet, hard-working fellows, of whom we had never expected that they would supplant our greatest orators. We cannot deny that there are *some* philosophers among us; but why should we always insist on bringing our peck of coals to New Castle?"

In short, we are fain to confess, that we have become plain, humdrum, practical men, trudging over the highways and by-ways of daily life in a way that to the ambitious undergraduate would appear insupportably monotonous. We have won no laurels; we are not famous; and the number even of those who have achieved eminence is small indeed. Perhaps fortunately for ourselves, we have settled down to the conclusion that these things, in themselves considered, are of very little account. We pray you do not remind us of the fox and the grapes. We are in earnest. It really matters very little whether or not our names be trumpeted by noisy fame—whether they be forgotten

when we are gone, or remembered to be the subject of continued eulogy or obloquy. No one, certainly, could be more capable of estimating popular praise at its true value than the great Dr. Chalmers, and yet he says: "The only popularity worth aspiring after is a peaceful popularity—the popularity that is won in the bosom of families and at the side of death-beds. There is another, a high and far-sounding popularity which is indeed a most worthless article—felt by all who have it most to be greatly more oppressive than gratifying—a popularity of stare, and pressure, and a whole tribe of other annoyances which it brings around the person of its unfortunate victim, a popularity which rifles home of its sweets, and by elevating a man above his fellows places him in a region of desolation, where the intimacies of human fellowship are unfelt, and where he stands a conspicuous mark for the shafts of malice, and envy, and detraction—a popularity which, with its head among storms and its feet on the treacherous quicksands, has nothing to lull the agonies of its tottering existence but the hosannas of a drivelling generation." Success in life, then, is not necessarily fame or greatness. A man's life may be a great success, though he be hardly known beyond the little circle of his immediate acquaintances; and on the other hand it may be an utter failure, though his name and fame should resound through all the earth. The faithful pastor, the conscientious physician and the careful teacher, are more truly successful than some men of genius whom we might name, who while they possessed immortal powers never used them for the benefit of their fellow-men.

We may therefore define success in life to be *the highest order of usefulness*, in whatever condition it may have pleased Providence to place us. This is an object worth striving for—an ambition that has the approval of God and of all good men. To study hard to become well acquainted with our profession, whatever it may be—to toil over rugged paths from year to year, with the sole object of becoming as useful as possible to our fellow-men—this is a passion that differs as widely as day from night from that ambition whose sole object is per-

sonal aggrandizement. You toil patiently, and though at times you feel as though you were accomplishing nothing, yet you are at all times sustained by the consciousness that you are doing your duty. "What matters it," says a recent writer, "if the footprints of each traveler cannot be distinctly traced. The path is hardened and perfected over which we tread, and generations yet unborn shall bless the workers who have gone before them and hardened the track for their feet. A single wave may blot out my memory and my foot-prints from the earth. Yet I toil on, for I know that my feet, now weary and travel-soiled on time's rough shore, shall be strengthened by their toilsome marching, and that one day, as my Master before me trod the troubled waves of Galilee, I shall go forth upon the shoreless, boundless sea, untroubled though alone." While, therefore, it is foolish, if not wicked, to seek to achieve fame and greatness for their own sakes, it cannot, on the other hand be doubted that an earnest and persistent effort to be useful will in the end be properly appreciated. The success which attends your labors produces gratitude in the hearts of those whom you have benefited—you gain influence in the community and are treated with proper respect—and at last grow happy in the consciousness, that your studies and efforts have not been in vain; that you are, in the best sense of the word, a successful man.

We propose to devote the present hour to the consideration of some of

THE CONDITIONS OF SUCCESS IN LIFE.

You will anticipate me in the reverent acknowledgment, that we can do nothing without the blessing of the Almighty; that success, like every other blessing, must find its ultimate source in God. As we journey on in life we feel more and more that we ourselves are nothing; that unless the Almighty has chosen us to be instruments in the accomplishment of His great purposes, "it is in vain to rise up early and to sit up late." Nevertheless, there are certain subordinate conditions of success, which in fact are nothing but the instrumentalities through

which our Heavenly Father carries out His wise and glorious designs.

1. The first of these is, of course, the possession of the necessary talents—the original aptitude of the man. Every man has his work to do, and when it is well done it is honorable. All may be useful in their sphere, and every well-meant effort in this direction is worthy of the highest respect. It were well if the dignity of labor were universally acknowledged; if it were felt, that to toil in forests, to delve in mines, and to work in factories is proper employment for men, and that no man loses one jot or tittle of respectability by laboring with his hands for his daily bread. So much of a radical am I in this matter, that I hope when the ideal republic becomes actualized in this country it will be the universal custom of those who have achieved success and command the respect of their fellow-citizens, to take off their hats to the honest laborer, however humble he may be, while they pass by the bar-room lounger and the gentlemanly loafer unnoticed as unworthy of the regard of honest men. While, therefore, we acknowledge, that every one who labors to be useful is worthy of respect, it is equally certain that not every man is suited to the highest order of usefulness. The cobbler in the Arabian tale made but a sorry Sultan. You may change the diamond into a piece of charcoal, but chemistry knows no process for turning charcoal into diamonds. There may, indeed, be occasional instances when men of very ordinary abilities may be said to have greatness *thrust upon them.* By some mysterious Providence they have been placed in a position where a single touch of the finger is enough to move a mighty lever. A feeble hand may thus become an instrument in the accomplishment of immense results; and the unreasoning multitude at once places the fortunate mortal by the side of those who have performed similar work by herculean labor.

Nevertheless, though such things occasionally happen, the man who is constantly expecting them to "turn up" in his own case, should be gifted with the patience and hopefulness of Wilkins Micawber. In all ordinary cases we look for the

greatest results where we find the greatest powers. Notwithstanding all that art can do, he who would be really successful must have a more than ordinary degree of talent. It is of the man whom God has gifted with a profound and comprehensive intellect that we may reasonably expect that he will discover hidden treasures of knowledge or systematize those that have been already gathered by his illustrious predecessors. It is the orator who is possessed of the inborn gift of eloquence—which, if it be genuine, must spring from an active brain and a tender heart—whom we expect to thrill and sway multitudes in the pulpit or at the bar. The man who is not gifted with that mysterious second-sight that beholds truth clad in beauty everywhere in God's creation, that finds "sermons in stones and good in everything," will never be a genuine poet, though he be thoroughly versed in all the minutiæ of versification.

In short, though it would be impossible to say what talents are essential to success, on account of the infinite variety of labor which we may be called upon to perform, it is certain, that those to whom God has granted the largest number of talents are those whom we generally recognize as our leaders, and who are therefore enabled to achieve the highest order of usefulness.

The man who possesses such natural abilities has received a high trust, which it is his duty to use conscientiously in the service of God and for the welfare of his fellow-men; while he who is compelled to walk, with Bunyan's Shepherd Boy in the "Valley of Humility," may comfort himself, if he be wise enough to know his deficiencies, with the reflection that he has escaped great responsibilities and dangers, and may be as happy as the greatest in the land if he will but labor to make others happy.

2. Another condition of success in life is, that we be properly prepared for our work.

This is not the place to rehearse truisms about the importance of education. On this point, certainly, we are all agreed. If the old gentleman is still living, who, a few years ago, was represented by the lecturers as entirely opposed to education,

and was consequently shown to be entirely in the wrong, he must be very aged and feeble, and I am sure he is not here to-night.

But when we come to consider the kind of education which is requisite for success in life, we find a vast difference of opinion. Is education the "educing or unfolding of the soul," or is it a mere accumulation of facts which may possibly be useful in after life?

There can be no doubt but that the latter view is to an uneducated mind the most plausible, because it is most superficial. It is hard for the uneducated to value knowledge for its own sake, apart from any temporal advantage which it may bring its possessor; it is difficult to feel the importance of a mental discipline that will make a man strong to achieve success in the particular vocation to which he may afterwards devote his energies. Hence, it is not surprising to hear men ask, "Why should I permit my son to spend his time and money in the acquisition of knowledge which he will probably never find to be of practical value? Why not teach him *at once* those arts and sciences that will be of use to him in everyday life, without passing through a tedious intermediate process?" In deference to such prejudices we find Polytechnic Institutes and so-called Business Colleges springing up all around us; and, however useful these institutions may be in their sphere, it is rather humiliating to find them overcrowded with students, while some of our most ancient and well-established Colleges complain that their classic halls are empty and neglected. We cannot, however, be surprised that such sentiments should prevail in the community, when we reflect how little many of us appreciated the true ideal of liberal training even after we had completed our collegiate course. I remember that on the day of graduation, one of my classmates slily whispered, "Chum, do you think these humanities will ever be of any use to us?"

It is really amusing to consider how little the young graduate knows of those things which are of daily use in practical life. He is probably unable to hold his own even in ordinary conversation, and is made to feel every day that he knows next

to nothing, so that he perhaps begins to consider himself—a big, overgrown booby. If he were to learn nothing after leaving College, if such a thing were possible, it is very probable that he would speedily become what he thinks himself; but fortunately our minds are so constituted that we must be constantly gathering information. Whether the man of liberal culture devote himself to a profession, or whether he be one of those fortunate (or unfortunate) mortals who are wealthy enough to remain on their ancestral acres, and enjoy at once their *otium cum dignitate*, (their "*opium cum digitalis*," as a druggist once called it, with involuntary appropriateness,) he cannot help becoming more or less acquainted with those things which it is necessary for a practical man to know. And now he begins to feel the immense value of his collegiate training. Every isolated fact, as it comes tumbling in on his consciousness, finds at once its proper relations; it does not become another fragment of a huge, unwieldy mass of information. He begins to feel that he has laid a foundation on which he may safely build; while the companions of his boyhood who, according to the prevailing spirit of the age, have slighted the College for the Polytechnic School, have probably gathered a vast amount of valuable materials, while they have not laid a proper foundation, and are even destitute of a plan for a future edifice. Moreover, as he passes on in life, and is brought into mental collision with persons whom he knows to be possessed of natural talents equal or superior to his own, he finds that his scholastic training has not been in vain; that it is better to be a practiced *athlete*, than to have a giant's strength without the skill necessary for rightly using it. It has been generally observed, that every good man of liberal culture commands an influential position in the community. Is it not evident, then, that such culture constitutes an important condition of success in life?

The fact that there are some "self-made men" who have achieved the highest order of usefulness, without having enjoyed the advantages of collegiate training, does not in the least militate against our statements. Noble fellows they are, and worthy of the highest respect. But the exceptions can

never disprove the rule. The fact, if fact it be, that one of the fastest horses in the country was for years employed in a common cart, certainly does not teach us to put our horses into carts in order to increase their fleetness.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not oppose Polytechnic Schools and "Business Colleges," any more than I object to Theological Seminaries, Medical Colleges, and Law Schools. They may stand by the side of these, if you choose, and accomplish a noble work; but they must never try to usurp the place of the regular College. We hope to see the day when Franklin and Marshall College will have a Theological Seminary, a Medical Department, a Law School and Scientific Halls and Museums clustered around her and protected by her fond embrace. But we can never agree, that our Alma Mater should yield to the spirit of this utilitarian age, and become a mere school of industrial and useful arts.

Ah! if our dream could be realized—if we could here behold a complete University, pervaded by that Christological philosophy which has made this institution so famous, what a wonderful influence would it exert on our nation and the world. For only in so far as an institution is pervaded by a true philosophy can it be really permanent and influential. Some one has said: "Let me write the songs of a nation, and I do not care who makes the laws." No doubt the sentiment is to a certain extent correct; we cannot refuse to acknowledge the tremendous power of national songs. Louis XVI. lost his head in response to the wild strains of the Marseillaise, and a century earlier James II. was *sung* out of his three kingdoms. Do we not remember how the people of Cornwall rescued their beloved Bishop from the hands of the infuriated tyrant, by singing:

> "And must Trelawney die?
> And must Trelawney die?
> Then thirty thousand Cornish boys
> Will know the reason why!"

It is not difficult to understand why popular songs should be possessed of immense influence, for they speak *from* and *to* the heart; but the heart of the people is not always aware that,

whether willingly or unwillingly, it beats responsively to the philosophy of the age, whether it be good or evil. The empire of thought, after all, rules the world. The man who teaches a nation how to think, exerts a greater influence than he who holds the reins of power. According to his ideas of right, the statesman frames the laws; according to the canons which he lays down concerning the true, the beautiful, and the good, the poet moulds his poetic conceptions, and the artist paints "books for those who know not how to read." And thus the rich fountain of thought which God has given to the philosopher trickles through myriads of brains until at last the whole world is pervaded by its silent, but irresistible influence. Men talk about the greatness of Cæsar, Charlemagne, Frederick Barbarossa, and the first Napoleon; but what *direct* influence can they be said to have exerted even on the generation that immediately succeeded them? Where Alexander ruled for a decade Plato ruled for a thousand years and more. The influence of Pythagoras and Aristotle, of Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas, of Kant and Hegel—not to speak of others, more modern and nearer home—is greater to-day than that of the most illustrious conquerors.

How important it is, then, that our educational institutions should be influenced by a philosophy that is catholic and true, and accordingly harmonizes properly with a course of liberal training. To have been placed under such influences must indeed be an important condition of success in life; and this advantage, we rejoice to say, the *alumni* of Franklin and Marshall College have abundantly enjoyed. The philosophy that prevails in this institution is no new thing—it is "the philosophy of the ages," developed according to the requirements of the times in which we live. It was adumbrated by Plato and Aristotle, and found in CHRIST its proper principle. The writings of St. Paul, especially, are full of it, and I cannot see how any one can properly appreciate his wonderfully profound doctrines with reference to the organic unity of Christ's kingdom, without having, at least to some degree, caught its spirit. It was the Christian philosophy that ruled the Middle Ages;

that gave the church and the world those great doctors, whose gigantic powers we are again beginning to appreciate after a season of forgetfulness. Nay, even the majority of the Reformers clung to it, amid all the storms of that fearful epoch, with unswerving tenacity.

Of course, there was at all times a philosophy so called, which claimed to rival that which was truly Christological. A philosophy of little things, that could appreciate no unity either in nature or grace but that which is visible and sensual. But such a philosophy can never be satisfactory to a thinking mind. As the universe in early ages appeared to be "confusion worse confounded" until Copernicus discovered that the sun was its centre, so it is with all our thinking until we discover that Christ is its centre and principle. All honor, then, to this institution for having done so much to bring these ancient and vital truths to light again. Though it has always been poor in this world's goods, it has exerted an influence which no language can express. What though "our college" does not always receive the credit which is its due, it matters not; so long as Franklin and Marshall College is true to its mission, it has a right to live—it is achieving the highest order of success, for it exerts the greatest degree of usefulness.

As for ourselves, fellow alumni, the reigning philosophy of this institution has become for us *a life*. Strangers insist, that we bear a strong family resemblance to each other. Whatever may be our profession—whether we write on law, medicine, or theology, the attentive reader can always discover the influence of our peculiar training. It is well that it is so. Though our thinking may appear obscure and uninteresting to those who delight only in that which is bizarre and sensational, if our Alma Mater has but induced us to have a more profound faith in our incarnate Lord, and to realize that we are *really* and not only figuratively "one body in Him," she has surely supplied us with one of the most important conditions of usefulness to our fellow-men.

3. A third important condition of success in life, is to find a sphere of usefulness that is in harmony with our tastes and

talents. While it is, no doubt, true, that there is no place on earth where a good man may not be useful, yet it matters not how great may be his natural gifts, or how anxious he may be to use them for the welfare of others, you can expect no decisive result from his labors if his way be hedged up by insurmountable difficulties; whereas, on the other hand, if his sphere be one in which he can feel at home—in which he works with alacrity and energy—there can be no doubt but that monuments of his usefulness will rise up on every side.

How important, then, it is, that we should have chosen that profession, or calling in life, for which we feel within us the capacities of success, together with that glorious enthusiasm that will bear us safely over unnumbered difficulties. As, however, I presume we have all made our choice, I will not enlarge upon this matter; and would merely venture to warn those young men who are about to enter our brotherhood, not to suffer themselves to be influenced by mercenary motives or the over-persuasion of friends to embrace a calling that is contrary to the bent of their genius, or their impressions of duty; for it will prove a curse instead of a blessing, a galling chain which only death can break.

When the decisive step is taken, and we have entered on the duties of active life, it is, of course, highly important, that we should make our residence at the place where our labors are most needed, or where it is probable that we can prosecute them to the best advantage.

Everywhere we find men residing in localities and occupying positions to which they are utterly unsuited, and where their best talents remain unappreciated; while in other communities and under other circumstances they might, with half their present labor, easily achieve the highest order of eminence and usefulness. That was a quaint conceit of the German poet Heine, in which he compares *life* with a certain game in which the art of the player consists in throwing balls and cubes respectively into round and square openings in a board. "Alas!" he adds plaintively, "there are *round* men and *square* men, and the world is full of *round* positions and *square* posi-

tions; but unfortunately men are not satisfied with places that suit them, but must needs try to creep into holes that do not fit their shape, and so the game is lost."

It is a common error to imagine that extraordinary talents are needed only in those positions which the world calls great, while men who have little talent and less culture can succeed better in an humble position, than those who possess these gifts in the highest degree. The contrary of this is often true. In the ministry, for instance, it requires a rare talent to "condescend to men of low estate." No one would probably venture to affirm, that John Frederick Oberlin required a lower order of talent to civilize and Christianize the Ban de la Roche, than his brother Jeremiah needed to fill acceptably the professorship of Logic in the University of Strasburg. Though the elder brother achieved eminence in his vocation, does not the world agree that he who became pastor of a miserable semi-barbarous Alsatian valley, and by sixty years of enlightened and self-denying labor caused the wilderness to "bud and blossom as the rose," was really the more talented as well as the more successful? And yet if the positions of the brothers had been reversed, is it not probable, from what we know of them, that neither would have achieved success?

It is evident, then, that there must be a natural adaptation for the work in which we are engaged, and that where this is wanting, the highest order of talent, or even genius itself, is not a certain surety of success. Of course, this is a faculty that may be cultivated; and he who would succeed must make up his mind, at the very outset, to take kindly to his work, whatever it may be, and to learn to sympathize with the people among whom his lot may be cast. It is, however, no slight disappointment for a young minister, for instance, to discover after preaching for months in stilted language to a rural parish, that all his fine periods have been worse than lost upon his audience. What a shock it must be to find, that though his people can appreciate sound doctrine as well as many a city congregation when presented to them in the language of the Bible and Catechism, there are innumerable words and phrases which

to their pastor are as simple as the alphabet itself, but which to them are utterly unintelligible. Moreover, as it is not in human nature to confess ignorance on such a subject, the pastor may for a long time remain unconscious of the true state of affairs, until the veil is lifted by some fortunate accident.

A country minister who lived in a foreign country—or, at least, I *hope* he did—once invited a theological student, who was his guest, to preach to his congregation. The next morning, as the friends were taking a walk together along the highway, the student, with perhaps a touch of vanity, inquired of his clerical host, what he thought of his sermon. "Oh, it was all very well," replied the latter, "but the people did not understand it." "Not understand it," repeated his guest in great surprise, "I am sure I carefully selected language that must have been plain to the meanest capacity." "Well! to make the matter short," responded the minister, "I remember you spoke several times of drawing *inferences* from your text. Here comes our neighbor Giles with his team; he is a good specimen of the average intelligence of the parish; let us see whether he can possibly have understood what you meant. Ho! Giles, Can you draw an inference?" "A what?" exclaimed the rustic, evidently greatly astonished. "An inference," repeated the minister. "Can you draw an inference?" There was an interval of silence, during which Giles vainly sought to understand the question. Suddenly, however, a bright idea flashed upon his mind and he exclaimed, "Look here, parson! you know this team as well as I do. If there is a pair of horses in the county strong enough to *draw* such a thing as *an inference*, I am sure mine can do it."

It is no doubt true, that the ranter and the charlatan often seek to hide their ignorance among those who are even more ignorant than themselves; but will you, on this account, refuse the meed of praise to those men of ability who are content to labor in obscurity, for the purpose of advancing the best interests of the poor and the neglected? Ought we not, for instance, to entertain the highest respect for those intelligent Christian physicians—of whom there are many—whose names

are but little known beyond their immediate practice, but who keep up a constant warfare with impurity and superstition, and who at last, by the undeniable success which they achieve, break the power of the quack and the sorcerer, and win the people to a mode of life that robs the sick bed of half its terrors? And can we refuse to honor the learned and talented Christian ministers who labor in rural parishes; who love their work, and by entering with their whole heart into the thoughts and feelings of the people, are able to clothe profound truths in simple language, and thus expand the intellect and warm the heart? Such men alone are able to achieve real success even among the lowly, and it is invidious to depreciate their abilities because they are not famous. Their work, indeed, requires a peculiar order of talent, but they are not less worthy of respect than their more eminent brethren. The man who can reach the mind and touch the heart of the people, and thus teach them to love the true, the beautiful, and the good, possesses one of the rarest and most glorious of gifts—a gift, which if properly used will insure the highest order of usefulness, and the approbation of our Father in Heaven.

4. The final, and perhaps the most important condition of success in life is earnest and persevering labor. "The destinies of the world," says the celebrated Bishop Dupanloup, "are in the hands of those who know how to work." Though this may appear to be a mere truism, it is probably after all the main condition of genuine success. Have we not often seen the ancient fable of the tortoise and hare exemplified in the history of our personal acquaintances? How many young men of brilliant abilities fail to be permanently successful because they depend solely on those natural gifts that enabled them to achieve their earliest triumphs. May not this be the reason why many of our college meteors are so speedily extinguished? They go forth in the full consciousness of their powers, expecting the world to bow to their transcendent genius. Rushing boldly into the tournament of life, they smite right and left as valiantly as did Roland at the route of Roncesvalles. But, alas! they do not wield the magic sword Durandal, with which the ancient

paladin is said to have cleft mountains at a single stroke. The world is large, and they will have no difficulty in finding foemen worthy of their steel, who will probably give them such a "trouncing" as will make them hide their diminished heads for very shame. The result is humiliation and perhaps despair.

Somehow or other we have no Admirable Crichtons in these latter days, who leap from the college into fame at a single bound. The man who would achieve success must not despise the day of small things; he dare not presume on his superior talents or knowledge. He must begin by performing what may be called the menial labors of his vocation; never fretting because the world fails to give him at once the position which is his due. Toiling intelligently and perseveringly, he will at last convince men that he can do more and better work than his fellows, and then, and then only, will they say to him "Come up higher!"

Moreover, such work when once commenced should be patiently continued until the end of life. It is a common error to imagine, that there is a certain point at which success may be said to have been attained in such a sense, that thenceforth labor is no longer necessary. Men who are still really in the prime of life, say to themselves: "I have worked long enough —I will now rest during the remainder of my days." So they call themselves superannuated at fifty, and are in their dotage at sixty when they might have been hale and hearty at eighty. Surely such persons are committing a grievous mistake. While they insure for themselves a dreary and infirm old age, they deprive the world of the richest and ripest results of their genius and labor. They should remember that the best fruits ripen slowly, and are thrown by Autumn into the lap of winter. It should not be forgotten that such men as Socrates and Plato, Michael Angelo and Titian, Dryden and Goethe, and hosts of others hardly less illustrious, not only showed no signs of decay, but labored incessantly and successfully when they had nearly or quite attained to fourscore years.

In short, it is better to *wear* out than to *rust* out, and he who would do his duty must make full use of the talents which

God has given him, and continue to exercise them so long as they remain in his possession. This is an indispensable condition of all genuine success.

Nevertheless, such success is relative only—it cannot be absolute. Nothing is an end in itself—it is at best a stepping-stone to something better that lies beyond it. The logician tells us that as every premise is itself a conclusion, so every conclusion may and should be made a premise for further reasoning. In the same way, success in life, if rightly understood, is itself a condition of absolute success in a higher state of existence. Our Saviour's parable of the talents contains the conclusion of the whole matter. Some of us have received five talents, others two, while still others possess but one. Let us conscientiously use them for the glory of God and the welfare of our brethren, so that when the Lord comes to the reckoning, He may receive His own with usury. We may rest assured that we will never achieve absolute success until we hear with astonishment and delight—but also with a profound sense of our own unworthiness—the Master's declaration, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

ART. VIII.—PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN.*

BY PROF. J. S. STAHR, A.M., OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE.

THE language spoken by the descendants of the first German settlers of this State, has so frequently, indeed so generally been called Dutch, that it might almost seem arrogant and presumptuous to call it by any other name. And yet there seems to be no good reason why a Pennsylvanian must needs be a Dutchman, or why his language must needs be misnamed and misunderstood. This is done, however, so persistently that we are in danger of breaking the links which bind us to the Fatherland, thus striking in the very face of History, and committing a blunder for which there is no excuse whatever, except that Dutch sounds somewhat like *Deutsch*. New Englanders have been in the habit of ridiculing the Pennsylvania Germans as a class of people destitute of all intelligence—thick-headed, thick-skulled, without love of culture or a desire for anything but filthy lucre—people who take better care of their horses than of their children, who have no higher ambition at all than to possess fine farms, large barns, and sleek cattle. Their language has been looked down upon and sneered at as mere jargon, weak, impure, and harsh—a kind of hash, fit only for those who have too little intelligence or taste to appreciate anything better. Such harsh judgments have been passed mostly by those who had no opportunity of examining properly into the character and language of these people, by persons who looked at the Germans from a distance, occupied a different standpoint, knew nothing of their origin and history, and hence

* Delivered before the students of Franklin and Marshall College, at the opening of the Spring Term, 1870.

could not appreciate what they saw and heard. But this has been done also by persons who dwelt among the Germans and were favorably impressed and kindly disposed; who, because they were unacquainted both with High German and the Pennsylvania Dialect, and were unable to meet the Germans on their own ground, did them unintentional injustice. Of late these people and their language have received a great deal of attention, and some interesting magazine and newspaper articles have been written concerning them. But whilst these articles contain much valuable information, they are also full of inaccuracies, and contain some serious blunders, so that they will necessarily make a wrong impression upon those who have not knowledge enough of the subject to form an independent opinion. It is not our purpose here to defend the character of the Pennsylvania Germans, or to apologize for their customs. They need nothing of the kind at our hands. We might no doubt find some things to blame, but also many to praise and to admire. We propose merely in the interest of History and Literature to examine their language, and, as far as we are able in this connection, to determine whence and what it is.

The language commonly but improperly called "Pennsylvania Dutch" is a dialect of the High German Language, and therefore entirely distinct and different from Dutch, the literary language of Holland. In order to prove this we turn first to history.

Immediately after the first settlement of Pennsylvania by the Quakers under Penn, when the proprietary announced that he would grant freedom of conscience and toleration to all religious denominations, streams of German immigrants, induced by religious persecutions at home, and by the promises of agents from Pennsylvania, poured into the colony and founded settlements which grew slowly at first, but steadily and surely, so that in a short time they became very prosperous. These streams increased in size from year to year; new installments were added from the Palatinate, Baden, Wurtemberg, Bavaria, and other provinces of South Germany, Mennonites from Switzerland and different parts of Germany, Dunkards from

Krefeld and Wittgenstein (Cleves, Prussia), Moravians and Schwenkfelders from Saxony (Upper Lusatia), and others, so that they soon formed the mass of the population in the inland districts, and thus handed down their own language and customs from generation to generation. The immigrants from Upper or South Germany were mostly Lutherans and Reformed, and came in such numbers during the first half of the eighteenth century that they were scattered widely over the territory now occupied by Montgomery, Berks, Lehigh and Bucks Counties, and impressed the character of their dialect upon all the German settlers of this district. It was among these men that Muhlenberg and Schlatter labored, and their success is well known.

The first German settlement was made by Francis Daniel Pastorius at Germantown near Philadelphia, August 12th, 1683. This at once became the nucleus of a German community the limits of which widened rapidly. In its bosom was born the celebrated mathematician and astronomer Rittenhouse, and here also lived Thomas Godfrey, the inventor of the quadrant. The Mennonites came to this country as early as from 1698 to 1711, but the largest numbers arrived in 1717. Many of them settled in Bucks and Montgomery Counties, but Lancaster has always been their stronghold, and here their influence on the German dialect is most observable. The Schwenkfelders and Moravians (whom Count Von Zinzendorf had protected for some time in Europe) came to Pennsylvania at a somewhat later date. The former settled in Berks and Montgomery Counties at or near Goschenhoppen in the year 1734 (only one hundred in all); the latter, the Moravians, took possession of Lehigh Valley, where they soon made the wilderness blossom as the rose. They were received first by Whitefield at Nazareth in 1739; in 1740 they purchased the site of Bethlehem, and settled there after the arrival of Bishop Nitzschman with a company of brethren and sisters from Europe. They afterward bought the "Manor of Nazareth" from Mr. Whitefield, and labored there also. Count Zinzendorf himself came to America in 1741, visited Bethlehem in 1742, and in connection with the brethren

labored very successfully among the Indians. New settlements and missionary stations were commenced at different points, but it would lead us too far from our subject to trace them out. Thomas Penn purchased the lands on the Tulpehocken from the Indians in 1732—33. "The door of immigration being now open, * * * thousands of all ranks and sects, from the haughty baron to the poor redemptioner, arrived annually and settled in the German Counties, Berks receiving her full share." The settlers of this county were principally Lutheran and Reformed; at first they had no churches nearer than *the Swamp* (Hanover) Montgomery Co.; afterwards they established their own congregations and grew rapidly. In this community Conrad Weiser, the Indian interpreter, figured very conspicuously, and was of great use during the Indian troubles.

The German settlements thus commenced (we do not pretend to name them all) spread farther and farther until they constituted a chain or belt extending from the southern boundary of the state north-easterly to the Delaware river, including the counties of York and Lancaster, Berks, Montgomery, Lehigh and Bucks. (We use the names of the counties by which they are now known.) Here we find a singular fact in the history of our state. Inside of this belt of German settlements we find the English, and outside of it we find a similar belt of Scotch Irish settlements, including part of York, and the whole, or nearly the whole of Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin, Lebanon, and Northampton Counties. Within the limits of the German district, Welsh settlements were made in Montgomery Co. at Pennlyn, Wales, Gwynedd, &c., and Scotch Irish settlements in Lancaster Co., at Donegal, Little Britain, &c., but the rule is as above stated. It has been suggested that there was some design in this on the part of Penn, viz.: to keep the English Quakers as far as possible from the Indians, leaving the Scotch Irish and Germans to keep them at bay. But the order in which we find the settlements proceeding from Philadelphia is no doubt determined by the order of time in which the immigrants arrived, and after settlements were commenced the different nationalities would naturally flock to their respective

centers of population. Certain it is, however, that for a number of years the brave, hardy Scotch Irish bore the brunt of the Indian attacks, and served as a bulwark to the settlers farther east. In course of time, however, the Germans pressed upon their neighbors, and gradually obtained possession of the whole, or at least the greater part of the fertile lands of Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin, Lebanon, and Northampton Counties, where their descendants are still found as lords of the rich soil, possessing the finest farming lands in the state, and so far as this goes we must acknowledge that they do like to live "upon the fat of the land."

These Germans brought their language and literature with them from the old country. They worshiped God in High German; their Bibles and Hymn Books were in this language, and they are so to-day. Whilst therefore in their daily intercourse with one another they used the particular dialect or dialects which they were accustomed to speak in the Fatherland, or such a modification of these dialects as was naturally brought about by their circumstances, they always retained a knowledge of the High German, and they have preserved it to the present day. There has been a falling away from the German ranks no doubt; in English communities Germans have been Anglicized. Their names even have frequently been changed, some by Penn when the settlers arrived and were *naturalized*, others by the persons themselves, so that we now find *Carpenter* for *Zimmerman*, *Hunter* for *Jaeger*, *High* for *Hoch*, &c. Still there is preserved in our midst not only the Pennsylvania dialect, but also the German Language. Among the early Lutheran and Reformed clergymen there were men of great learning, good classical scholars, and even some accomplished poets, as for instance Pastorius, Helmuth, some of the Protestant monks at Ephrata, &c. These were succeeded by others worthy to wear their mantles; if they were their inferiors in classical learning, they were still well educated—at all events able to speak pure German. Thus a knowledge of High German has been perpetuated, and if there are at the present day Germans (?) who cannot understand a High German sermon com-

posed of pure and simple words, it is because they have learned to undervalue and despise the language of their fathers, and have neglected to learn to read it, or they have become altogether faithless to the church, and have been carried away by the stream of worldliness in which so many perish.

In this brief historical survey we have not been able to discover anything that looked like Dutch. There are only two points where the history of Pennsylvania comes at all in contact with the Dutch, and neither of these could have any bearing on the language spoken here. In the first place it is well known that the Dutch Reformed Church, acting through the classis of Amsterdam, sent Reformed ministers to the Germans in this state. But these ministers were Germans, and spoke the German language to a German people. Secondly, there were several Dutch settlements in Delaware County, and at Minisink, now Monroe County, perhaps even before the arrival of Penn; but these settlements were small, unimportant, and were either abandoned entirely, or merged into later English settlements.

It might naturally be supposed that the Pennsylvania dialect would undergo important changes during the lapse of so many years, so as to vary considerably from its original form or forms. Dialects change rapidly, particularly where there is no written language to keep them in proper bounds. Two families of the same barbarous tribe may separate, and, after the lapse of one or two generations, find themselves using two different dialects, neither of which is intelligible to those who speak the other. The case becomes different however when there is a written language around which the dialects cluster, and where the district is small, and communication so frequent as in Pennsylvania, no great variation would be likely to occur. There are a number of sub-dialects, however (of which we shall take due notice at the proper place), which betray the influence of the original dialects spoken by the first settlers. We may mention here the influence of the Moravians, who taught pure High German in their schools, and hence spoke very correctly, and that of the Mennonites, who spoke a broader dialect than

the others. But that the type of Pennsylvania German is South German, and that no changes of any importance, except the introduction of English words, have taken place, is put beyond all doubt by the fact that there are now dialects spoken in South Germany which not only bear a striking resemblance to Pennsylvania German, but are really almost identically the same, particularly the Pfälzer dialect. Change a few vowel sounds, especially those of the modified vowels or *Umlaute* ö and ü, which are wanting in Pennsylvania German, eliminate English words and one or two English idioms, and you make our dialect perfectly intelligible to the *Pfälzers*, whilst no Pennsylvania German has any difficulty in understanding them.

Pennsylvania German is a *dialect* of the German language. Hence many persons look upon it as an inferior, degenerate language, a falling away from pure German—the base daughter of a noble mother. But the relation which a dialect sustains to its literary language is not of this kind. If language in some form or other is a necessity for the reason, as all must admit, there can be nothing artificial or mechanical in its origin and growth. It is not the gift of God in such a sense that man is furnished with words for which he finds the proper ideas, and puts proper thoughts into them. Words and ideas cannot be joined in any such mechanical way. Nor does man *invent* language, so that he first has the thoughts or ideas, and then fixes upon certain sounds or words to express these ideas—sounds or words adopted by universal consent for certain specific purposes; for how could there be such a thing as consent or agreement without language as a means of communication between men? The human mind is so constituted that it cannot develop without thinking, nor can it think to any purpose without spontaneously producing words as a form wherein thought is to be enshrined. Language is therefore in one sense the gift of God. The *power* or *faculty* of language is from God; but language itself, or the expression of thought, is the spontaneous product, not the invention of the mind. Language develops with the mind; it grows with its growth and strengthens with its strength. It is modified and moulded

by surrounding influences, just as the mind itself is affected in this way. Hence we find endless varieties and changes in language giving rise to different dialects, yea, even to languages which seem to be entirely different, so that many are ready to deny that they could possibly have a common origin. But the most eminent comparative philologists of our day, like Max Muller, are ready to affirm that affinities can be discovered in all languages, affinities which become more striking and significant in proportion as the field of research is enlarged. We need not hesitate therefore to claim a common origin for all languages. Taking now any particular language or class of languages, it is undoubtedly necessary to assume a starting point where the growth of language commences, and from which it branches out in different directions. But it is not to be supposed that this starting point exhibits the highest excellence that can be attained. If humanity is historical, so also is language, for the latter gives expression to the character of the former in all stages of its development. Language therefore grows, and changes its form according to the nature and character of the people whose historical life it represents. It has to do not only with individuals, but also with communities and nations, and bears the impress of the latter no less than of the former. We can easily see how tribes and families coming from the same general stock may become separate communities, develop certain peculiarities, and yet retain common traits of character which serve as the basis again for union in a higher form as a nation. Now whilst the general is the basis or ground of the particular, we nevertheless learn to know the former through the latter. Individual tribes or families, in the history of nations, awake to self-consciousness first, and afterward they become conscious of a broader life which they possess in common with a whole nation; and it is the province of history to develop this consciousness in particular cases, binding family to family and tribe to tribe, just as it is the province of education to enlarge a man's idea of existence, and make him a citizen of the world—to break down the barriers which hedge him in at first, and make him truly *cosmopolitan*. Dialects

therefore which give expression to particular phases of national life, to the peculiar life of tribes and families, precede in the order of time and the order of their development the cultivated literary languages under which they are included, just as spoken language precedes written language. It has been truly said that in every literary production we have the expression of a threefold life; national life, expressed in the general language, the life of a particular district, expressed in the dialect, and finally individual life, expressed in the peculiar style of the author. The fixed, cultivated, written language of a people binds the hearts of all together no matter how they may be divided geographically or politically, and it becomes necessary or possible only when a nation, be its limits wide or narrow, becomes fully conscious of itself, so that all the individuals included can meet upon a common basis. In the various dialects we have not so many vitiated forms of an original language, but the first, simplest, truest expression of all the elements of a nation's strength, and from them (the dialects) the literary language is formed. We find these different dialects throughout the entire history of the German nation, from the earliest period down to the present time. At the time of the Reformation, Latin was generally used as the written language of the Germans, although many different dialects were spoken. These dialects were divided into two general classes: High German, spoken in the elevated, mountainous regions of South Germany, and Low German spoken in the low, level portions of North Germany. Two dialects of the latter class have been developed into written languages, one into the English (based on Anglo-Saxon), and another into the Dutch. Luther fixed the character of modern High German by his translation of the Bible. He took the dialect of Saxony as spoken at the court of the Elector, as a standard, and through the labors of himself and his coadjutors the Bible was made to embody a language which at once rallied all the High German dialects around itself and found its way into thousands of hearts and homes.

Pennsylvania German, as a High German dialect, having its origin and history altogether separate from the Dutch, gives

expression to a particular phase of German life, moulded by the plastic hand of culture, customs, soil, climate, &c. As such it has perhaps elements of strength, advantages and excellencies not now found in the literary High German, whilst it is no doubt also deficient in many of the best traits of the cultivated High German.

It is of course impossible in our present limits to specify all the peculiarities of Pennsylvania German, so as to give an adequate idea of its form to those who are not familiar with it. We may however state a few general principles which will enable any one conversant with High German to read and understand the dialect without difficulty. In the first place, it must be borne in mind that the letters have the *South German* sound; *a* has the broad sound like the English *aw; st*, and *sp* wherever they occur sound broad like *scht* and *schp*, &c. Secondly, letters are commuted or changed. Instead of the proper sound of the modified vowel or *Umlaut ö*, we find the sound of the German *ē*, or the English *ā*, and instead of *ü* we find *ie* or *i* equivalent to the English *i* in *machine*, or the same shortened as in *pin*. Instead of the proper sound of *eu*, we have the Ger. *ei* or the Eng. *ī*. Instead of *au*, particularly when it undergoes modification in inflections, we have broad *a* or *aa* in the unmodified, and *ä* or *ää* in the modified form. Thus we have *Baam* for *Baum*, and Bääm' for *Bäume*, *laafe'* for *laufen*, and *laaft* or *läääft* for *läuft*. The diphthong *ei* is often changed into long *e* or *ee;* thus for *Stein* we have *Stee';* for *Bein*, *Bee';* for *Eid* we have *Eed*, for *Leid*, *Leed*. *A* is often changed into *o*, as *Johr* for *Jahr*, *Hoor* for *Haar;* *i* is changed into *e* as *werd* for *wird*, Hert for Hirt, &c. Consonants are also frequently changed; *b* into *w*, *p* into *b*, *t* into *d*, &c. Thirdly, words are shortened by dropping the terminations, especially *n* of the infinitive, or generally after *e*. Prefixes are frequently contracted, so also compounded words. Thus instead of *werden*, *folgen*, *fangen*, we have *werre'*, *folge'*, *fange';* *einmal* becomes *emōl*, *nicht mehr*, *nimme*, &c. Fourthly, the Pennsylvania dialect uses H. G. words in a different sense. Thus for *Pferd*, horse, we have *Gaul*, which in H. G. means a heavy farm-horse

or an old horse; *gleiche'* from the H. G. *gleichen*, to resemble, to be like, means in the Pennsylvania dialect to like, to be pleased with; *gucke'* from H. G. *gucken*, to peep, to pry, means to look. Finally, we find English words introduced in their full form, either with or without German prefixes and modifications; e. g. *Store, Rules, Cäpers, Circumstänces; trävele, stürte, fixe, fighte.* This is an element of weakness in the dialect, or in those who use it, but it also helps to bring prominently into view the flexibility of the German language.

If we examine the inflections of words in this dialect, we find them much simpler and less complete than in High German. Nouns have scarcely any changes of form except to distinguish singular and plural; these, wherever they exist, are the same as in H. G. One of the most striking peculiarities of the dialect is this: The genitive case is never used. To denote the idea of possession, the dative is used in connection with a possessive pronoun. Thus instead of High German *der Hut des Mannes*, we find *dem Mann sei' Hut;* instead of *das Licht der Sonne, der Sunn' thr Licht.* To denote other relations, prepositions are used. The definite article is the same as in High German except that some of the sounds become so obscure as to be scarcely heard. The indefinite article is the same in the three genders nominative, *en* for *ein, eine, ein;* where it changes in the other cases, it follows the analogy of High German. Demonstratives and other adjectives are regularly declined except in the genitive; the neuter terminations are frequently dropped. The definite article is used for *dieser, diese, dieses*, and *seller, selle, sell*, for *jener, jene, jenes.* The adverb *wo*, is used instead of the relatives *welcher, welche, welches.* Another peculiarity of this dialect is that all these words have no separate form for the accusative masculine as in High German; the nominative form is used. In the inflection of pronouns we find for the nominative plural, first person singular, *mir*, instead of *wir.* The verb has no imperfect tense. Wherever we find either the imperfect or perfect in High German, we always have the perfect in Pennsylvania German. In other respects the verb is like the High German, except that some of the terminations are

dropped. Some auxiliaries take *tt* in the second singular instead of *lst*. Thus from *wollen* we have; *Ich will, du witt, er will, mir wolle', ihr wolle', sie wolle'*. *Haben* changes *a* into o in the second and third singular present; *Ich hab, du hoscht, er hot; pl. mir hen* (from *han, haben*), *ihr hen, sie hen.*

It may not be amiss to quote the opening stanza of Dr. Harbaugh's "Heemweh" in this connection, giving it first in Pennsylvania German and afterwards in High German.

PENNSYLVANIA DIALECT.	HIGH GERMAN.
Ich wees net was die Ursach is',	Ich weiss nicht was die Ursach' ist,
Wees net warum ich's dhu;	Weiss nicht warum ich's thu';
'N jedes Johr mach ich der Weg	Ein jedes Jahr mach ich den Weg
Der alte, Heemet zu.	Der alten Heimath zu.
Hab weiters nix zu suche' dort,	Hab' weiter nichts zu suchen dort,
Kee' Erbschaft un kee' Geld;	Kein Erbschaft und kein Geld;
Un doch treibt mich des Heemgefiehl	Und doch treibt mich das Heimgefühl
So stark wie alle Welt;	So stark wie alle Welt.
Nor'd stärt ich ewe ab un' geh,	Dann reis ich eben ab und geh,
Wie owe schun gemeldt	Wie oben schon gemeld't.

Here the expression "wie alle Welt" is peculiar; the other deviations from High German are all in accordance with the principles laid down above,

There are variations in the Pennsylvania dialect as spoken in different parts of the state. "Joseph Henry" in the "Guardian" (March No. 1868) says: "It (Pennsylvania German) may now be said to consist of at least three plainly marked sub-dialects. One of these is principally spoken in Eastern Pennsylvania; the second, west of the Schuylkill; and the third among the lesser German sects in Lancaster County and elsewhere. The last mentioned sub-dialect is most unlike the others, and may at once be distinguished by its peculiar drawl." The idiom of Eastern Pennsylvania is purest and comes nearest to High German, whilst that of Lancaster County is broader and deviates most. Here no doubt the native dialects of the first immigrants make themselves felt so as to produce these variations although the mode of life, and the surroundings of the people also have a tendency to influence their language.

There are two ways of writing Pennsylvania German. Some scholars maintain that the orthography ought to conform as

nearly as possible to the High German, whilst others aim only at representing the sounds of words, and hence incline to the English sounds of letters. The former of course is preferable so long as we pretend to write German.

If we ask now, What is the literary value of Pennsylvania German? it is not difficult to find an answer. As its construction is simpler and less involved, and its words shorter, it is, of course, more fluent than High German. It flows easily and naturally, so that it seems to be the easiest thing in the world to talk, on the part of Pennsylvania Germans, whilst High German is rather precise and cumbrous. The vocabulary is full so far as the ordinary topics of every day life are concerned, as one would naturally expect in a dialect. Our Pennsylvania Germans are mostly farmers, or thrifty, well-to-do people in the common walks of life. Here their dialect answers every purpose, and they have probably preserved words and constructions not now known in High German, so that it is natural even for educated men who are conversant with High German or English, to adopt this dialect in familiar intercourse when they wish to lay aside formality and restraint. But on the other hand, when the topic is literary or religious, High German answers the purpose better; for the words and terms relating to these topics have not been cultivated to the same extent. Besides this, the want of cases, and the poverty of inflections in the dialect, make High German preferable. The German is well known as one of the clearest and most precise languages in existence, capable of giving expression to every shade of meaning, and therefore unsurpassed in philosophy and theology. Here the Pennsylvania dialect is far inferior. High German may be compared to a well-trained horse, saddled and bridled, moving regularly according to the most approved principles of horsemanship; whilst Pennsylvania German reminds us of an unbridled steed careering over the fields for his own gratification in joyous freedom. High German bears us along with the stately step of the soldier in close ranks according to the *drill* of some famous sergeant, whilst Pennsylvania German allows the freedom of the *route step*, and thus puts us more at

ease. The straightforwardness of the Pennsylvania Germans, their honesty and want of ceremony are all expressed in their dialect; *must* be expressed there if the principles laid down above are correct. Let it be borne in mind that these people are Germans, among whom "vows bind less than clasped hands;" people who hate hypocrisy, deceit, and pride of every kind. (If some of them have degenerated, the more's the pity.) You meet no kinder people in the world—open-hearted, cordial, hospitable—suspicious of innovations, probably too much so, but firm and true when they are won for any cause. You cannot fail to admire their character. But you must not expect great professions, ceremony, or an array of compliments; their dialect is not rich in these. You may enter their homes as they sit down to their meals, or when they are seated. You do not disturb them; they will say: "*Kumm setz' dich bei, un nemm's mit uns so gut as mer's hen;*" and if you sit down, you are welcome. Meet them at home, and you find them easy and graceful if you approach them properly; take them away from home, or try to make fine gentlemen of them all at once, to make them formally polite, and you will see as fine specimens of blundering awkwardness as you can desire. If they can overcome this *awkward* tendency, and become polished gentlemen by proper training—as they undoubtedly can—so much the better for their universality, their ability to adapt themselves to time, place, and circumstances; you could perhaps not turn so easily into their mode of life. Now, just as we find the people, so we find their language, and neither can be understood without understanding the other.

Pennsylvania German is undoubtedly also inferior to High German as regards the richness and purity of vowel and consonant sounds. If modern High German is inferior to the German of the first classical period, so far as fullness of sound and purity and distinctness of utterance are concerned, a cultivated ear very readily detects a still farther falling away in Pennsylvania German. In consequence of the vowel changes to which we have already referred, some of the best sounds of the language have been lost, and there is too little variety in

those that remain. Many consonants have also lost their sharpness and distinctness, so that words no longer stand out free and clear, like coins fresh from the mint. Whatever strength there may be in the dialect, this is undoubtedly an element of weakness.

But is Pennsylvania German adapted or qualified, if we may use that word, to become a cultivated literary language? We do not hesitate to answer in the negative, and yet we do wish not to be classed with those who sneer at Pennsylvania German poems, and call them mere jargon. The dialect has now its literary language—High German—and this answers every purpose, as fully as if Pennsylvania German itself were developed and exalted so as to become a literary language. It must therefore remain a dialect, but as such it is not excluded from the domain of literature. It has its office as a dialect, a work, a mission to which we have already referred. It is to give expression to a particular phase of German life, to serve as the organ or mouth-piece of feelings and states of mind which lie deeper, become more special than those expressed by High German. Philosophy, theology, and the loftier themes of poetry lie beyond its domain; but it claims, and has a right to claim, a domain of its own within which *popular songs, lyric poetry* in different forms may appear from time to time, manifesting a poetical power in the bosom of a single community which sings what is peculiar to it in strains as sweet as those in which Gœthe expressed the consciousness of the whole German nation. It has always been thus. Popular songs and popular poetry are made not for the people, but by the people; whether this be done by the whole community so that poetry grows insensibly, as was the case in the first classical period of German literature, or whether one individual becomes the organ of the rest, and thus expresses what all feel. It is true, the most profound work of genius, that which is most universal, is also the most special, embodies the deepest experience of the individual. But universalities may be broader or narrower; there are elements of feeling, phases of life, which appear only in a certain sphere, and these can best be expressed in particu-

lar dialects. Thus we find Scotch poetry, than which none can have charms more sweet to the native of fair Caledonia, or him who has learned to understand and appreciate this dialect. We find in German literature a Hebel and a Claudius, who labored in similar fields; and we have to-day Fritz Reuter and others who make use of particular dialects, and carry the hearts of the people with them, as they could in no other way. It is not surprising therefore that the attempt should be made here in America. Indeed the only wonder is that it was not made much earlier than has really been the case. Rev. Mr. Rondthaler of the Moravian Church led the way by writing an Evening Hymn: "*Margets scheint die Sunn so schee*," published in Schaff's *Kirchenfreund* in August, 1849. At the suggestion of Dr. Schaff, Dr. Harbaugh next made the attempt, and produced "*Das Schul Haus an der Krick.*" These poems soon became exceedingly popular, so that Dr. Harbaugh was encouraged to continue his labors, perhaps rather recreations, in this sphere, the result of which will probably soon be in our hands in a neat little volume.* Since the way has been opened, others have tried to court the muse with considerable success; among these we may name Revs. Keller, Dubbs, Weiser, etc.

If any one is disposed to ridicule Pennsylvania German, to call it weak and incapable of giving expression to definite ideas, let him study Dr. Harbaugh's "*Schul Haus an der Krick;*" he will perhaps find more descriptive power, and greater beauty of expression than he expects. Or take the poem called *Heemweh*, which we consider equal if not superior to the former. There are few descriptions in any language so touchingly beautiful, and so simple withal, as the stanzas in which Dr. Harbaugh describes his father and mother, the former sitting on the porch meditating, the latter as she stood at the railing looking after him with tears when he first left home. And how could he better have described his own feelings when, after his parents were dead and buried, he came back to visit

* Harbaugh's "Harfe" has made its appearance since the above was written, and we are not disappointed in it. It is a HARFE indeed.

the old homestead, and stood before the house hesitating whether to go in or not, than in lines like the following:

Ich wees net, soll ich' nei' in's Haus,
Ich zitter an der Dheer!
Es is wol alles voll inseid,
Un doch is alles leer!
'S is net mei Heemet wie's mol war,
Un kann's ah nimme sei';
Was 'naus mit unsere Eltere geht
Kommt ewig nimme nei'!
Die Freide hot der Dod geernt,
Das Trauerdheel is mei'!

So geht's in dere rauhe Welt,
Wo alles muss vergeh!
Ja, in der alte Heemet gar,
Fiehlt mer sich all allee'!
O, wann's net for der Himmel wär,
Mit seiner scheene Ruh,
Dann wär mer's do schun lang verleedt,
Ich wisst net was zu dhu,
Doch Hoffnung leichtet meinen Weg
Der ew'gen Heemet zu.

If Josh Billings and Hans Breitman with their corrupt and mongrel English serve to amuse, and are said to be not without merit by persons who ought to be critics—if these productions, the language and orthography of which are very often *made up* to serve a purpose, may exhibit certain phases of American life, and thus have some literary value, how much more is this the case with our Pennsylvania German poems? Here every word, to Pennsylvania Germans, is a "sound from home," every description a vivid picture, every expression strikes a chord in the soul that thrills every nerve, and the echoes of which haunt the spirit long after the sound itself had died away. But here the mission of Pennsylvania German comes to an end. Let it be content in its own sphere, proud of its relation to High German, modestly directing to *that* domain, where German genius has been active for so many centuries, all who wish to become acquainted with German life, German culture and German literature.

Art IX.—CUSTOMS IN THE REFORMED CHURCH OF HESSE.

BY REV. E.W. REINECKE, NAZARETH, PA.

In following the discussions with regard to doctrines and customs which have taken place, of late years, in the Reformed Church, we have often thought that too much account has been made of her Palatinate origin. We are not disposed to deny that the original main stock of Reformed settlers in the United States may have been immigrants from the Palatinate. The sad condition of this country about the beginning of the last century, seems to have made emigration on the part of its citizens a relief, if not a necessity. They consequently came over to America in such numbers as almost to appear like a migration of the entire people. But from the very extent in which this migration took place, it soon exhausted itself; so that, even before our Revolutionary troubles, it had become annually less, and soon ceased altogether.

But granting that among the original Reformed settlers of our country the Palatinate element may have preponderated, there seems, nevertheless, to have been among them a considerable admixture of other Reformed nationalities. If we look at our earliest Reformed Ministry, the preponderance is decidedly against the Palatines. Turning to Harbaugh's "Fathers of the Reformed Church," we find that among the fifty-two ministers of whom biographies are given, *only nine* are traced with certainty to the Palatinate; the remainder being divided among Switzerland, Nassau, Hessen, and other countries of Germany. Now, although we would not maintain that the nationalities of the Reformed laity were in the same ratio as that of the clergy, yet it seems highly probable that the latter had some influence on the sources of immigration; so far, at least, as influencing their friends to follow them. Exceptionally, at least, some en-

tire settlements seem to have been other than Palatines. Thus, according to Harbaugh, the Reformed settlers of Lehigh County in Pennsylvania, were Swiss and Huguenots. And, if we were to consult the Church Records of our older congregations, we would, perhaps, find few of them where the French, or Huguenot element, was not to some extent, perhaps largely represented.

However this may be, it seems undeniable that after our Revolutionary struggle the Reformed immigration from Germany assumed a new complexion. The English Government, in bringing over soldiers from Hesse and other Reformed countries, assisted in producing this change. After the close of the war, many of the Hessian soldiers preferred to remain in America, and thus helped to increase the numerical strength of the Reformed Church. Others, after having remained a considerable time, returned to their native land, to spread there glowing accounts of the wealth, prosperity, and liberty of the new country. In this way, perhaps, was inaugurated that second Reformed immigration, which has also assumed such large proportions. Nor must we, if we would form a correct estimate of the constituency of the Reformed Church in America, forget the immigration from Switzerland, and from Lippe and other small Reformed counties of Germany, which has been going on for many years, and is still annually bringing over to us large accessions of strength and numbers.

Such being the constituency of the Reformed Church in America, it has seemed to us utterly unhistorical, unphilosophical, and impolitic, to try to model it in all its parts according to the Palatinate order. As regards doctrinal standard, we are willing to admit for the Heidelberg Catechism a kind of Reformed Œcumenical character, but even this not in an absolute sense. For, although this catechism was highly honored in all parts of the Reformed Church, it was by no means universally adopted, even by the Reformed German nationality, as the text-book of religious instruction. But as regards the Palatinate Liturgy, this has never received universal recognition in the Reformed Churches of Germany. It seems to be an undeniable fact that

these Reformed Churches, although there was a fundamental doctrinal animus which formed a bond of union between them, nevertheless constituted themselves freely as regards external organizations, customs and cultus or worship. Hence we find among them great divergencies in respect to these points; nor was the bond of fraternity broken on this account. Every separate nation and people was allowed to form its church observances and liturgical customs freely, without interference from others. And this freedom went so far that Calvin himself gave his endorsement to the Anglican ritual.

The evident historical duty and present policy of the Reformed Church in America would therefore seem to be, not to repristinate and force into general use the obsolete liturgy of one portion of it; and that a portion of it, which has no longer an independent, much less a national existence. The Church of which we speak is not a simple, but a complex body. Its constituency consists not of one, but of many German nationalities, among whom, according to the inherent principle of the Reformed Church, liturgical customs were allowed to constitute themselves freely. Evidently, the part which we have to perform, is, to mould these various tendencies into one: not by ignoring all the rest in favor of one of them, but by uniting all into one organic whole, and thus to establish in our land the one and united Catholic Reformed Church.

We think that in constituting this One Catholic Reformed Church in America, the Reformed Church of Hesse has a right to be heard. She formed no inconsiderable portion of this Church in Germany; and at present her children form no inconsiderable portion of it in America. We wish to lay before the readers of the "Review" some of her Church customs, *written out from memory,* in order to show which way her influence would tend, and what her voice would be in the final settlement of our theological discussions and controversies.

The Church year was strictly observed. We mean by this not merely that certain Sundays were called by certain names; and that certain high festivals were called by certain other names; and that on these certain Sundays and festivals certain

prescribed portions of the Scriptures, called Gospels and Epistles, were invariably read. Of course, all this was the case in fact; but it included, moreover, that this Church or sacred year had thoroughly entered into the consciousness of the people: so that time was measured by it, rather than by the civil year. The high festivals, Christmas, Easter and Whitsunday, had invariably three days allotted to them. On the first day of each of them the Lord's Supper was administered, with divine services both forenoon and afternoon. On the second day there were again two services. On the third day, there was generally only a forenoon service, whilst the afternoon was devoted to visiting and recreation. As might be expected, Christmas was the most joyful festival. From the very beginning of Advent the mind assumed a festal tone, which rose higher and higher, until it reached its climax and completion in the festival which commemorates the miracle of all miracles, the Son of God manifested in the flesh. The Epiphany season seems to have been a gradual letting down of the mind from its joyful, festal tone to the sadder season of Lent; which latter was again a gradual preparation for the saddest of all the days in the year, the day of the crucifixion of our Lord. Passion week was observed with a peculiar strictness; for, although there was not an entire cessation from secular employments, yet the mind, from the peculiar discipline it had received during the preceding Lenten season, was generally in a tone of quiet sadness and deep earnestness. On Maundy Thursday the children of the parish were generally gathered together in the Church. Good Friday was observed with the most religious earnestness. There was an utter cessation on it of all secular labors throughout the entire parish, and the hum of business was completely hushed. Nothing was heard but the tread of the passer proceeding solemnly to the Church. But in the Church also the worshiper was at once reminded of the great fact of the occasion, the crucifixion: for on the altar, which occupied the most prominent place in the Church, and which was draped in mourning, was placed a small Mt. Calvary with three crucifixes upon it. Of Easter and Whitsunday, nothing more need be stated, besides what has

been already stated, except that on the latter, the Church, with every house in the parish, was decorated with a profusion of green boughs.

But whilst we are in the Church, we may as well take a closer view of it. It will be seen at once that it is mainly divided into two parts, the chancel and the nave. The former is somewhat narrower than the latter; but the Church being large and capable of accommodating several thousand worshipers, its proportions are not at all mean. It is also raised several steps above the nave. The small Gothic pulpit stands at the projecting angle, where the chancel and nave meet; and below it is the seat of the minister, who is never visible to the congregation, except when at the altar or on the pulpit. The central and prominent object of the chancel is the altar; a real altar, not a mere communion table. We have been informed by one who had seen it, that the altar originally had been built up of dressed stones: that when rationalism had achieved its triumph in the Churches, this altar had been removed and a mere table placed in its stead: and that after the revival of positive Christianity began to be felt, this table had been in turn removed, and a wooden altar put up, with various vestments of cloth and linen to suit the different occasions.

And whilst we are upon this part of our subject, we may as well take a view of the congregation and the services. The women have their pews in the nave; and as they quietly take their seats, they bow their heads forward in silent prayer. The men ascend the galleries, and before they take their seats, they place their hats before their eyes, and also engage in silent devotion. A procession now enters the Church. It consists of the school-boys, headed by their teacher, who conducts them to seats especially reserved for them in the rear of the Church, whilst the larger of them ascend to the organ-loft to act somewhat in the capacity of a choir. All these boys have their hymn-books in their hands; for they come from the school-house, where they have been for an hour practicing the hymns to be sung on that day. Now comes the officiating minister, preceded by the acolyth, who opens the door of his pew before

him, and again closes it after him. The minister is not robed in the clerical gown; but he is distinguished by the peculiar clerical scarf hanging down over his back, and by the clerical cravat, the name of which we cannot now recall. And now the entire congregation chant, unaccompanied by the organ, the German plain prose translation of the *Veni, Sancte, Spiritus*, or Komm Heiliger Geist. But here we regret that our memory fails us in several small particulars. We know that the congregation, with the accompaniment of the organ, sang several hymns before the sermon; we know also that the minister read the Gospels and Epistles, and invariably the liturgical prayers at the altar; and that each time he issued from his pew, the acolyth opened and closed the door before and after him. But whether the reading of the Gospels and Epistles formed one distinct act, and the reading of the liturgical prayers another, the two being separated by a hymn on the part of the congregation; of this we are uncertain, although we are inclined to think that the two acts were separate and distinct. So also at a certain stage of the worship of the congregation the acolyth filled a burnished censer with live coals and poured incense upon them. Then he slowly proceeded along one aisle, swinging the censer, up to the altar, where he stopped and swung it several times, and then down the other aisle. Though not quite certain, we presume that this act took place just before the offering of the liturgical prayer, in order to represent and symbolize the prayers of the people. On certain solemn occasions this act was performed several times. After another hymn, the minister ascended the pulpit to preach the sermon, which was preceded and followed by a short free prayer. A closing hymn and the benediction ended the worship.

In the belfry of the church were several grand old bells. This, of course, was nothing extraordinary. But these bells were used not merely to call the congregation to church on Sunday and the festivals. Besides this use, they were heard every day in the style and character of the bet-glocke, the prayer-bell. They were not rung in the manner of the noisy jarring fire and alarm bells; they were struck and made to

chime in true canonical order. To the best of our recollection they were heard three times daily, thus calling the parishioners from their secular toils to remember their spiritual duties.

Baptism was always administered in the presence of *sponsors*. What the Reformed Church of Hessen believed and taught with regard to this sacrament, we will show by a few extracts from its Liturgy. This book we obtained from the library of the late Dr. Hoffeditz, himself a native of Hessen, and who very probably used it in the administration of clerical acts. The form of Baptism proceeds as follows:

1. Address of the pastor, and prayer.

"Beloved in the Lord; since we are here assembled in the name of our God for the purpose of administering, according to the command and institution of Jesus Christ, Holy Baptism to this Christian child, and thereby to assure unto it the washing away of its sins by the blood of Christ as also regeneration by the Holy Spirit, let us therefore heartily, and with true faith pray as follows."

Of the prayer we give merely the following: "And this child, which is now to be incorporated with Thy church, receive it among Thy holy people and into the communion of Thy dear Son; and work within us all according to Thy gracious promise that we may with true faith and hearty giving of thanks accept Thy great mercy unto this child, which Thou in Holy Baptism, which we now according to Thy command do purpose to administer unto it, wilt Thyself baptize, and regenerate from its sinful and damnable nature; that so all may henceforth hold this child as Thy child and heir; and thus assist it, that it may be trained to sanctify Thy name, and enlarge Thy kingdom."

In a foot note to the above rubric, an extract is given from the Liturgy of 1657; a time when, according to Dr. Sudhof (See Art. *Hessen*, in *Herzog's Encyclopedia*) the Heidelberg Catechism was used as text book, not only in the High schools, but also almost universally in the parochial schools of Hesse. We allow ourselves a short extract from it.

"Beloved in the Lord. Since we are here gathered to admin-

ister Holy Baptism, it is proper first of all to consider the mystery of Baptism, its true signification and purport.

"Holy Baptism is the first sacrament, in which the redemption of our Lord Jesus Christ is imparted to us, and our sins pardoned and washed away.

"It therefore becometh us well to consider the three following points. First, That we are entirely corrupt by reason of original sin, and are born with such a nature and kind, which is at enmity with God our Creator and with all good, and is therefore with all its wisdom and righteousness damned forever. Secondly, that no one can help us and deliver us from such inborn corruption, except our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone restores and makes right again that which had been ruined and corrupted by our first parents. Thirdly, that the same our Lord Jesus Christ will in Holy Baptism wash away all our sins, regenerate us, incorporate us with Himself, clothe us with Himself, impart unto us His Holy Spirit, and make us His children and heirs of eternal life."

But we return to the Liturgy of 1842. Here follows:

c. The Confession of Faith by the Sponsors, which consists of answering to three questions and the Apostles' Creed. The third question proposes: "Do you renounce Satan, with all his works and ways, and the world with all its malice?"

d. The act of baptism.

e. The blessing of the baptized, which is as follows: "Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has regenerated thee by water and the Holy Ghost, and has through Christ Jesus forgiven thee all thy sins, anoint and strengthen thee with His saving grace, unto life everlasting. Amen."

f. Returning of thanks, which is throughout in the spirit of the preceding.

g. The Benediction.

It would be interesting to give other extracts from this baptismal form, but our space admonishes us to desist. We would yet state, however, that the Form of Confirmation contains the same renunciation as the one already given.

But before leaving this liturgy, we must yet be allowed a

brief reference to the Form of Preparation for the Holy Communion. This consists of three parts. The first proposes three questions to the candidates for communion, which they are required to answer with an audible *yea*. The second is a penitential prayer, or confession of sins. The third is the absolution, followed by a short thanksgiving. The absolution is as follows: "All ye who have truly confessed your sins, and have heartily and with sincere faith cried unto God for mercy and forgiveness, be ye comforted and assured that the Almighty Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is gracious and merciful unto you, and pardons all your sins for the sake of the sufferings and death of His beloved Son, Jesus Christ; and in the name of the same, our Lord Jesus Christ, according to His commandment, and by authority of His word, when He says, '*Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained*,' I do, as a regular and ordained minister of the Church of Jesus Christ, pronounce you that repent and believe to be fully acquitted, and absolved of all sins, that they all be as fully and perfectly pardoned unto you, as Jesus Christ has remitted the same by His sufferings and death, and has commanded to preach it through His gospel in all the world. This comfortable assurance, which I have now in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ made unto you accept ye with a joyful heart, therewith contenting your conscience, and firmly believing, that your sins are assuredly forgiven you, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

Before we close this rapid and imperfect sketch, we would yet advert to some customs which were observed in connection with the burial of the dead. Funeral sermons were, to the best of our recollection, never preached. Perhaps there was a short exhortation at the house or at the grave. But what was peculiar and calculated to lend a deep solemnity to the occasion was the fact that the scholars of the parochial school were required to attend these funerals, to head the procession, and at intervals during the progress to the cemetery to sing solemn funeral hymns. In advance of the coffin also marched in single

file three men clothed in long, black mantles, kept for the purpose by the parish, and bearing each a cross from which a streamer of black crape floated on the air.

But why do we make these statements? Certainly not because we think that the Reformed Church in America should be constructed exclusively on the model of the Reformed Church in Hesse. But we do think that in laying the foundations of the Reformed Church in our land, which we are really doing now, we ought to be guided by a broad and Catholic spirit. If we would act historically, and lay a foundation for which the Reformed Church of the future will bless us after we have gone home to our fathers, we must gather up both the evangelical and Catholic elements, which are furnished us by the different provincial branches of the Reformed Church, and thus build a beautiful temple unto the Lord, complete and harmonious in all its parts.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

LIGHT-HOUSES AND LIGHT-SHIPS: *A descriptive and historical account of their mode of construction and organization. By W. H. Davenport Adams. With illustrations from photographs and other sources. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.*, 1870.

Another volume of the Illustrated Library of Wonders. It comes in the usual excellent dress, and is full of valuable information, conveyed in the most entertaining style. We have before spoken of these books as valuable for the young. They will lead the young to form a taste for solid reading over against novel reading, to which they sometimes give themselves up just for the want of something of this kind suited to their capacity and years.

THE EARLY YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY. *By E. De Pressense, D.D., author of "Jesus Christ: His times, life and work." Translated by Annie Harwood. The Apostolic Era. New York; Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway.* 1870.

We have not yet had time to examine this work, as it has just come into our hands. From what we have read we are impressed with the vigor, freshness, and originality of the author's style, even though it comes through a translation. This volume is one of four—viz. *I. The Apostolic Era. II. Martyrs and Apologists. III. Doctrine and Heresies. IV. The Church Worship and Christian Life.*

AMERICAN POLITICAL ECONOMY: *including strictures on the Management of the Currency and the Finances since* 1861, *with a chart showing the fluctuations in the price of Gold. By Francis Bowen, Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity in Harvard College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.* 1870.

A volume of about 500 pages, neatly and substantially published by Scribner & Co. It is not only by an American author, but, as its title imports, on American affairs. The author takes the position, that while the general principles of Political Economy are the same everywhere, yet the science is modified by different nationalities. Hitherto we have been much dependent on foreign works, such as those of Ricardo, Malthus, McCulloch, J. S. Mill, Say, and others. They, too, have treated the subject deductively, while Prof. Bowen regards it as especially an inductive science. The main body of the work is occupied with a discussion of our finances, especially with reference to the necessities created by the late war. On the subject of Protection he takes a position, different from Political Economists generally, in favor of Protection. The work has received favorable notices from the press generally. As a practical work, adapted to the particular circumstances of this country at the present time, it will be read and studied with interest.

3 1198 04015 1404
N/1198/04015/1404X

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

3 1198 04015 1404
N/1198/04015/1404X